WYCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY
3 1761 02873 0430

W. P. Coleman

23 : xii . 49

J. G. Kern

155

MYSTICISM AND THE CREED

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
DALLAS · SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

MYSTICISM AND THE CREED

BY

W. F. COBB, D.D.

RECTOR OF ST. ETHELBURGA'S IN THE CITY OF LONDON
AUTHOR OF
'ORIGINES JUDAICAE,' 'THE PSALMS,' 'THEOLOGY OLD AND NEW,' ETC.

33737
WYCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1914

BT
993
C62
M9

4517 7067 V

COPYRIGHT

PREFACE

THERE is no dearth of works on the Creed, and the names of Caspari and Kattenbusch, of Harnack and Zahn, Burn and McGiffert in recent times, and of Pearson earlier, are enough to show the activity of scholarship. But the works of these authorities [1] are for the most part concerned with the form or history of the Creed, and only secondarily, if at all, with its content and meaning. And it is difficult to find any work in recent days which makes a systematic attempt to state the meaning of the Apostles' Creed from a point of view which modern thought has made to be that of the ordinarily well-instructed Christian. In the absence of anything better supplying the demand for such a work the following pages have been written, and are offered with diffidence to those who feel an imperative necessity for reconciling somehow their thought and their feeling in religion.

For we are living in a new world. In the half-dozen centuries during which the Apostles' Creed was moulded into its present form, the presuppositions of religious philosophy were widely different from those which now prevail. It would, of course, be foolish to speak disparagingly of days which were made brilliant by the disciples of Socrates,

[1] With the exception of Pearson, of course.

Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Epicurus, and Carneades, and by the Neo-Platonic school. It was not that there was any dearth of the power of abstract thought; what was wanting was that accurate knowledge of Nature and its laws which Aristotle tried to discover and modern science has secured. Ancient thought proceeded along the high *a priori* road; modern has stooped to observe patiently the phenomenal world. And while observing the world of not-self, it has been led to understand better the Self which did the observing. Hence has arisen a science of the physical world, and also a science of logic and epistemology, which have made it possible for Dr. Bosanquet to declare recently [1] that in the main the philosophic work of showing the connection between importance and reality has been done. If this is a correct diagnosis, then it would seem imperative that the Christian Church which deals with "importance and reality" [2] should seriously ask herself how far the interpretation of her Creed may be affected by the philosophic spade-work which Descartes initiated.

One far-reaching difference between ancient and modern thought is alone important enough to force us to reconsider our Creed. Ancient thought was discursive, dualistic, materialistic. To the Stoics, for example, Νοῦς was indeed immaterial but not immaterial in the modern sense. Its sole importance lay in its being a mover of matter. And the soul, too, was of a material nature. As Zeller says [3]: "Upon clearer examination, the difference between the materialistic and idealistic

[1] *The Principle of Individuality and Value*, Preface.

[2] From another view-point, it is true, than that of philosophy, but from one which has even more pressing consequences.

[3] *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics*, p. 146.

description of God vanishes. God, according to Stoic principles, can only be invested with reality when He has a material form. Hence when He is called the Soul, the Mind, or the Reason of the World, this is only done on the assumption that these conceptions have a material form." Moreover, though Reason, or Zeus, ruled all things, as the noble hymn of Cleanthes puts it, yet it was not certain that that Reason was secure in itself from arbitrariness. Hence exceptions might occur at any moment, and in the popular belief they were always happening. The miraculous, therefore, in the only legitimate sense of the word, viz. the *arbitrary*, was believed in then. It has become impossible for anybody with a tincture of modern thought to believe in it now. The serious Theist, of course, holds that Νοῦς, Reason, Will, is a *vera causa*, that God is the active *causa causarum*, and that whatever is done upon earth He does it Himself. And he sees no contradiction of this proposition in Mill's statement, that " to constitute a miracle a phenomenon must take place without having been preceded by any antecedent phenomenal conditions sufficient again to reproduce it," for he regards this definition as a testimony to the *trustworthiness* of God's acting.

That the Law of Causality, then, however constituted by us, rules without exception in the whole field of our experience is now an axiom based on centuries of painful observation and reflection, and it is not at all likely that this axiom will again be seriously questioned. It is true that our most brilliant living philosopher insists on Life as essentially indeterminate, but he at the same time also insists that Life itself works invariably through

mechanism. Or, as Lotze puts it, the mission which mechanism has to fulfil in the structure of the world is as absolutely universal as it is at the same time completely subordinate. That is to say, Freedom is characteristic of Life, but the range of Freedom does not extend so far as to enable it *when it manifests itself* to defy the law of mechanical necessity. In other words, the miraculous as a violation of the experienced Law of Causality is impossible to modern thought.

Nor can the force of this conclusion be evaded by pointing to a continuous miracle, for that is a contradiction in terms, nor to a continuous series of miracles, for if the members of such a series show a uniformity of sequence they cease to be miracles, and if they do not we should simply ask whether they did or did not contradict established laws of science. If they did contradict them we should call in question the evidence adduced, and if they did not we should seek for the at present undiscovered law of sequence. In any case the man of to-day would proceed on the presupposition that nothing was likely to conflict in reality with the Law of Causality, and hence that the belief in a miracle as an event in itself transcending the mechanism of Nature is a superstition. Nor is he shaken in his conviction by any cheap jibe, such as that which says that, "if miracles do not happen it is a miracle if they do not," for he rightly regards this apophthegm as the embodiment of a puzzle-headed play on words. And in this connection it is interesting to note the modern tone of the argument used by Chrysippus, that all things happen *καθ' εἱμαρμένης*, since divination would be impossible were not all things foreordained.

The history of modern science and philosophy is the history of the gradual conquest of the contingent by Reason. Our forefathers lived in a wonder-world, full of good and evil spirits, the laws of whose activities, if there were any, were unknown, who at the best were accessible by magic alone. But as science extended its boundaries the realm of contingency grew smaller. First magic, as a device for utilising the unknown power, or powers, in human interests was shown to be irrational—incoherent, that is, with firmly established knowledge; and then came the turn of the miraculous, or capricious acts of the one Supreme Power. And of this it is now true to say that its disappearance has been due to a more refined and a more complete sense both of the Wisdom of God and the immediacy of His working. Men cannot believe any more in miracles, as defined above, not because they think less of God, but because they think more. We shall have no repetition of mediaeval miracles for the simple reason that Faith in God has ousted Credulity in Nature. And the term which stamps the new attitude is Evolution, which has been defined as a "natural history of the cosmos including organic beings, expressed in physical terms as a mechanical process," a definition, however, which both the theist and the moral philosopher might properly seek to correct by adding the proviso that Evolution can describe the process, but not the Life which produces the process. That Life, whether it be the Life of the Supreme Spirit, or of our finite spirits, is self-determined *in itself*, and only submits to the mechanical process when it goes out of itself into objectivity.

It is in this inner world of subjectivity where the

essential truth which once it was sought to set out by the miraculous finds itself at home. Man as a member of the phenomenal order is by God's appointment under Law, that is mechanical necessity. God, too, as working in and through that same order is, because He is what He is, self-bound by the same Law. But though God is in Duration and man in Time, yet the full statement of the metaphysical riddle of Time is that Time-distinctions are not transcended in the sense that they are negated or abolished, but that they form the modifications of a Being who in the abstract is out of Time and in Eternity. The " Unconscious" is timeless, but when it comes down into consciousness it takes upon it the mantle of Time, and evolves in Time. So the subject, before thought sets in, though not yet an actual subject at all is to be thought of as out of time.

On the other hand, the only Subject we know as a concrete thing is always in Duration, or true Time, and yet is subject to the law of necessity. The paradox is that man is free, and yet as soon as he exercises his freedom he ceases to be free. And this paradox seems insoluble.

Hence the capacity for self-determination which men sought once to establish in the phenomenal order in the guise of the miraculous, has now been transferred to its true home in the Timeless. And it would seem that the task before Christian thought to-day is to show how the self-determination which man must maintain, or else cease to be man, is to be reconciled with the uniformity of Nature. He cannot be content to be merely part of the mechanism of Nature, nor can he wholly cut himself off from Nature's dictatorship. He finds himself a denizen

of two worlds at once, and to him comes the Christ through His Church promising to show him an effectual way of unifying these two worlds. For this is what is meant by the discredited term, Salvation.

The following pages will, it is hoped, throw some little light on the problem set to the ordinary Christian to-day when he is called on to express his belief in terms of the Apostles' Creed. For good or for evil he encounters a fixed form in a world where it is of the very nature of forms to be alterable as men's needs alter. He may have no wish to expose this particular form to the incidence of this law of change and growth, but in that case it is the more necessary that the thought which interprets the form should be proportionately the more free. For if both form and content are made alike immobile a creeping paralysis at once sets in. And the end of that is the death of religion.

How (*a*) to conserve the treasures of past duration, which is what a fixed Creed seeks to do, while (*b*) at the same time retaining freedom to create the future anew, is the problem set to anybody who sets himself seriously to consider what he means when he says his Creed. Nor will he solve his problem by ignoring either of its two members. Both have to receive their due, and both must have the place that is their due in any new synthesis the student may make. But this is only to say that the difficulty of holding to the dialectic process in the interpretation of the Creed is but a particular case of the difficulty which faces us in our interpretation of Life as a whole.

It will be observed that throughout the following pages the assertion reappears, sometimes explicitly,

but more often implicitly, that what thought loses in concreteness by the abandonment of the miraculous as capricious it will be found to regain in a more comprehensive and more invulnerable theology founded on Mysticism. But to many Mysticism is but a word of reproach covering every conceivable kind of credulity and looseness of thought and expression. And it must be confessed that the suspicion has much foundation.

But, on the other hand, the word does stand for a mode of consciousness which is as well attested as any other. It may be true that the mode of consciousness in which God is the object is less frequently met with than that which brings with it the pleasures of a City dinner. But what matters is not the quantity of the testimony, but the character of the witnesses, the tests to which they have been subjected, and the worth of the content of their testimony. From this point of view nobody need be ashamed for placing credence in St. Francis of Assisi, St. Catherine of Siena, St. Bernard, Thomas à Kempis, St. Thomas of Aquino before his crucifix, William Law, Jacob Boehme, or even that most wooden of all mystics, Emanuel Swedenborg. Nay, we may go further. As Mr. Sharpe says: "The Apostles were certainly mystics in the fullest sense; and the mystical tendencies of sub-apostolic times are evidenced and fairly represented by the 'Shepherd' of Hermas and the writings and authentic acts of many of the early martyrs. The self-chosen title of St. Ignatius, θεοφόρος, the God-bearer, implies a claim to the possession of mystical experience of the most far-reaching kind. But mysticism—or at least the temperament which seeks knowledge by means of illumination rather

than discursive reasoning—belongs essentially to human nature, and appears, under one form or another, wherever thought is free." [1] This witness from a Roman Catholic writer may be supplemented by the witness of another—Father Poullain. In his *The Graces of Interior Prayer* he opens with a definition : " We apply the term mystic to those supernatural acts or states which our own industry is powerless to produce, *even in a low degree, even momentarily,*" and afterwards in explaining why he introduced the words he has italicised he says that they give expression to an idea which is implied by all mystic writers, viz. the impossibility of procuring the mystic state for ourselves.

The two points insisted on by these two writers severally are important for the purpose of these pages, if indeed it be not found that in the final analysis they run into one. The mystic experience is *not* the fruit of conscious endeavour, or self-discipline, or continued prayer or meditation. These may fit the soul for the gift, but when it comes it comes from Another. On the other hand, we might be reminded that there is nothing out of the ordinary in this particular mode of experience. For even on the ordinary level of sensuous experience we are powerless to perceive without an object of perception, and when we do perceive we do so in virtue of faculties which no labour of ours produced by themselves.

And on the higher ranges we find that the activity which we put forth in thought is accentuated, if anything, and that the object of thought is yet not created by us. The Ego is the meeting-point of subject and object, but the Ego is incomprehensible

[1] *Mysticism*, p. 56.

without its ground, which is God. In every act of personality God so far from being the sleeping-partner is the Unseen Companion who shapes the end which the Ego does but rough hew. Which is but to say with Father Poullain that every mystic act is supernatural, because God is concerned in producing it, and with Mr. Sharpe that it is natural, in the sense that the " inner circle of the devotees of any cult " is not bounded by any hard and fast circumference separating the devotees from the main body of their fellow-worshippers.

Mysticism means certainly the capacity for immediate communion with a higher Power which is considered to be Supreme, but this communion may be accompanied by any one of every possible degree of fervour. The flame of mystic union may burn steadily and with lustre hardly perceptible, or it may be a fire of enthusiasm carrying all before it, and it may rise to the heights of self-oblivious ecstasy. But to confuse the mystic experience with the abnormal, the eccentric, the occult, or the vague is to miss its whole meaning. It may perhaps be said to be as a sixth sense, or a second group of senses, whose working is interlaced with the working of all our senses, and all our scientific and artistic activities. Those who see into an event, a movement, a set of circumstances, a person ; the people of shrewd common sense, the inventor, the artist, the poet, the enthusiast of humanity, all who *see* the hidden connection of things, their deeper meaning, above all, those who have an unfailing tact for the world of values inside the world of appearances compose the mystics of humanity, and by virtue of their mystic vision, its natural leaders.

It is to be feared that while the method of this work may be impugned by common sense as tending to throw doubt on the credibility of the historical, the mystic on the contrary may object to it on the ground that it introduces too much philosophy. To these two we would reply briefly. To the first, that history is an accident of Religion, and not its *differentia*, that, therefore, the truth of the history —its correspondence with fact—does not necessarily affect the truth of the Religion—its correspondence with Reality. Further, that the truth of the history may be accepted and even fought for in the name of Religion without Religion itself being concerned at all. And again, that history at its best and highest is but form and not life. It is the expression of a Mind or Minds, the moment in a process, and derives all its value from the Mind or the process. If history is to be connected with Religion at all it must be in the humble capacity of a hewer of wood and drawer of water, and must be content if on occasion its services may even be dispensed with. It must submit to Amiel's dictum : " Le déplacement du christianisme de la région historique dans la région psychologique est le vœu de notre époque " ; and to Goethe's

> Alles vergängliche
> Ist nur ein Gleichnis.

History is but an adjective to the substantive Religion whenever the two enter into union.

To the second we reply that the condition of all sane Mysticism is that it submits itself not only to the " primacy of the practical reason," but also to the critique of the pure reason. For only so can it be saved from exaggeration, perversion or ex-

travagance. It is no doubt correct to say that Mysticism is concerned with the further side of the line " where mortal and immortal merge and human dies divine," and is at home there only. But in this world nobody is allowed to stay at home ; he is condemned to wander abroad, and Mysticism is not free from that law. It must submit to the fetters imposed by Reason, and become discursive under the guidance of Logic. And whereas it would be glad to be allowed to end with the declaration : " Omnia exeunt in mysterium," it must bear to pass the rider : " Omnia exeunt in philosophiam."

One subsidiary point belonging to a lower sphere, the sphere of history, will also claim our attention. How far are we justified in maintaining the venerable belief that the origin and explanation of Christianity are to be sought, if not entirely, at all events chiefly and preponderatingly in the soil of Jewish religion ? No doubt we will remind ourselves that so long ago as 1741, Dr. Conyers Middleton, Principal Librarian of the University of Cambridge, published a little volume entitled *A Letter from Rome, showing an Exact Conformity between Popery and Paganism, or the Religion of the Present Romans derived from that of their Heathen Ancestors*, and that the theme of this volume has been a commonplace of Protestant controversy ever since the sixteenth century. But it is suggested in the following pages that we must go much further, and enquire whether the main doctrines of generally accepted Christian theology, the main conceptions and ideals enshrined in its system both in East and West, both in Protestantism and Romanism, are not better explained by reference to ethnic antecedents than to Jewish.

If it appear that this can be shown more easily of the course of things on the Catholic side than on the Protestant, this fact will not necessarily lower the value of the former, as it may be due to the further fact that Protestantism has in its own self-interest borrowed its ethos and methods from Judaism. To be consistent, it may seem that Protestantism should go but a short step further than it has gone in its most advanced representatives, and break the few remaining links by which it is connected with the early days of Christianity.

If it can be shown, however, as in the following pages it is sought to be shown, that the intellectual and institutional and devotional forms of historic Christianity derive from Paganism, we shall succeed in placing it on a surer because a broader foundation, and shall thereby show that it is the religion which embraces all the truth and goodness and beauty which the Spirit of Jesus Christ could claim as His own in "the dispensation of Paganism." And certainly the Church will be the purer and stronger from the banishment of yet one more superstition. For more and more those who insist on tracing the distinctive facts of the Gospel to Jewish antecedents are being driven to find those antecedents in other places than the O.T.—in Rabbinical doctrines, in late developments and in that syncretistic Judaism which was penetrated so thoroughly with foreign elements, and especially with elements which had been transplanted from Persian and Babylonian soil to take root in that Hellenistic garden in the midst of which Judaism found itself. It makes little difference whether we see a direct or an indirect influence. The crucial point is the influence itself.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

Mysticism and Tradition

	PAGE
The Individual and the Community	1
The use of the Creed by Puritans, by Catholics	2
The use of the Creed by the Mystic	3
The conflict between Prophet and Priest	4
Pantheism and Theism	5
Psycho-physical Parallelism and the Soul	6
Mysticism and Tradition	7
Appearance and Reality	8
Mysticism and Miracles	10
Answer to the objection that Miracles transcend Law	11
The true realm of self-determination	12
All discriminate in the Creed between its form and its content	15
The Mystics and theology	16

CHAPTER II

The Mystical Base of Christianity

The nature of Christianity: mystical or historical	18
The fallacy of the ambiguous use of the term *form*	19
The essential characteristic of Christianity	20
Judaism in New Testament times syncretistic	21
Christianity as a Mystery-religion	22
Some axiomatic truths	27

CHAPTER III

The Nature of Mysticism

Mysticism as a protest against Formalism	31
Mysticism as transcending Thought	32
Mysticism and Feeling	32

PAGE

Mysticism as immediacy of apprehension . . . 33
Mysticism as the result in the Soul of the direct act of God 34
Mysticism sometimes regarded as mere passivity . . 34
Mysticism as identical with sacramentalism . . . 36
Mysticism as the individualistic factor in Religion . . 37
But Mysticism also is the sole foundation of a religious community 38
The Mysticism of Jesus Christ and the Apostles . . 39
Mysticism as the Ground of all forms 41

CHAPTER IV

Mysticism and the Creed

Interest in the form and its content apt to vary inversely 44
The use of the Creed by the Mystic 44
Presumption that the Creed embodies mystic Experience . 45
General occurrence of triadic divisions 46
Mysticism and the historical articles of the Creed . . 47
Christianity as the expression of the ideal Man . . 48
Christianity as the dialectic of the Christian notion . . 50
Mystical interpretation of the Creed a need of to-day . 51
Mysticism the spring of missionary zeal . . . 53
Religion and coercive jurisdiction incompatibles . . 53

CHAPTER V

The First Article

I believe

The Creed the confession of faith of the individual . . 58
Yet even so it is a socialising document . . . 59
The import of πιστεύω εἰς 60
The ground of interested attention, whence derived . . 61
The meaning of " belief in God " 62
Believing in Jesus identical with being baptized into Him 63
The voluntarist nature of Faith 64

CHAPTER VI

The First Article (*continued*)

God the Father Almighty

The triune formula. 66
Father as a term of Mysticism 67

PAGE

Father as a religious term proper to Hellenism . . 68
The N.T. meaning of the term *Father* 71
The use of *Father* by the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel 72
Fatherhood of nature or of grace? 75
Descent and ascent correlatives 76
The meaning of *Omnipotent* 77
Almighty in the Creed better rendered *All-governor* . . 78
The field of God's sovereignty—Nature and Man . . 81
The world of inner Freedom most clearly reveals God's sovereignty 83

CHAPTER VII

The Second Article

In Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord

The Incarnation a perennial fact 102
The truth better expressed as "God *as* man" than as "God *and* Man" 104
Christ the interpreter of God and not conversely . . 105
Man explained by a trichotomy or a dichotomy? . . 106
The meaning of the personal Name, *Christ Jesus* . . 107
An examination of Phil. ii. 5-11 107
Some arguments for the pre-existence of Souls . . 109
The Incarnation an eternal process 109
The witness of the Fourth Gospel 110
Something in the name *Jesus* not in the name *Christ* . 111
The work of Jesus is salvation through a gift of Life . 112
Distinction between our sonship and that of Jesus . . 114
God as Unmanifest the Father, as Manifest the Son . . 115
Is the Universe in its essence Personal? . . . 116
The necessity not only for Thought but also for Religion of the Other 117
The unknown origin of the term Christ 120
Is a term of psychology before it is a term of history . 121
Christ is Lord within; Jesus is Lord without; and the two are one 122

Additional Note on Pre-existence and Reincarnation . 124

CHAPTER VIII

The Third Article

Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost; born of the Virgin Mary

The Article devised to assert the Manhood rather than the Godhead 134

PAGE

No single account in the N.T. of the " mystery of the Incarnation " 135
Reasons for omitting all discussion of the *fact* of the Virgin-birth 135
Yet the story of the Virgin-birth is no gratuitous legend . 137
The true nature of a *symbol* 138
The *matter* of the symbol derived from experience, its *form* alone unique 139
The relation of Ecstasy and Art 139
The Virgin-birth if a religious moment must be a symbol . 140
Analogies in other cults to the Virgin-birth . . . 141
The permanent truth which inheres in all " myths " . . 144
The story of the Virgin-birth is typical of Regeneration in general 145
The meaning of the phrase " conceived by the Holy Ghost " 147
The ethical importance of the term *Virgin* . . . 150
The significance of the symbol of Mother-and-Child . . 153

CHAPTER IX

The Fourth Article

Suffered

The Law of Progress and Suffering 155
This Law exemplified in the vegetable and the animal worlds 157
Moral failings are forms of suffering, and are therefore called *Passions* 158
The Spiritual Man suffers more acutely because his interests are wider 159
With the Law of Suffering goes the Law of Compensation . 159
All resistance to conation involves pain, and the resistance to desire for God the utmost pain 160
So the life of Jesus Christ is under this Law of Suffering . 161
This is illustrated (*a*) by His " temptations in the Wilderness " 161
And (*b*) by the symbolic description given in Luke xviii. 31-34 167

CHAPTER X

The Fourth Article (*continued*)

Under Pontius Pilate

Pontius Pilate to be regarded as a typical figure . . 171
The part played by Satan 172

PAGE

The explanation of the problem of Evil suggested by Evolution 172
The Law of Manifestation is progress through Duality . 173
All dualities may be regarded as special cases of Attraction and Repulsion 174
In the moral sphere Jesus and Satan are opposites . . 174
Satan is the Power resisting and to be resisted . . 175
Hence one chief function is that of the Tester of men . 177
Ecclesiastical systems as a form of evil 178
Herod as the type of official cynicism 179
Judas Iscariot as an instrument of the Great Tester . . 180
Pontius Pilate as representing the Evil known as the " State " 181

CHAPTER XI

The Fourth Article (*continued*)

Was crucified, dead, and buried

The Cross a mystical symbol 192
Its connection with similar symbols, burial, resurrection, and ascension 193
Crucifixion is the Christian name for the supersession of Egoism by Love 194
The Egoist in La Rochefoucauld and in George Meredith . 194
Crucifixion not to be identified with " Asceticism " . . 196
Crucifixion as a law of the Divine Life 197
Crucifixion as a law of Creation 199
This is the explanation of suffering in the world . . 200
Crucifixion of the Christ 200
What in Nature is Necessity becomes in Him Freedom . 201
Crucifixion as the law of Christian life 202
Crucifixion as the at-one-ment of the inner nature . . 204

CHAPTER XII

The Fourth Article (*continued*)

Dead and Buried

Death and Life correspond to the bodily and the spiritual Σῶμα Σῆμα 205
The meaning of the saving of the soul 206
The paradox of saving the soul by losing it . . . 207
Salvation consists in self-transcendence 208

PAGE
Burial is a threefold process 209
The Burial of God in His world constitutes its secret . . 210
And explains the Nature-worship of antiquity . . 210
Is the explanation of the Beauty seen in Nature . . 211
The Burial of the Spirit of man in his earthly Nature . 211
This the explanation of the sense of sin . . . 212
And is the ground of our Freedom 213
It is, moreover, the explanation of the authority of Conscience 214
The Burial of the " Old Man " a negative process . . 216
The positive side of this Burial is the inner presence of the living Christ 216
Why the tomb of the Christ was called a new tomb . . 217

CHAPTER XIII

The Fifth Article

He descended into Hell

The Descent into Hell follows naturally on the Burial . 218
Connection with the truth of the Incarnation . . . 218
Necessity of the Incarnation to our Salvation *ex suppositione* 219
Answer to the objection that the Descent is only historical not mystical 219
This objection is fatal to all well-grounded Theology . 220
For all Theology at bottom rests on the Analogy revealed by Mysticism 221
By Analogy, then, we see the Descent to mean also Descent into the presence of Sin 221
This means the harrowing of Love by its intimacy with Egoism 222
But the Spirit also suffers a quasi-death and a Descent . 222
The Christ's Descent into the Soul-abyss . . . 223
In a sense also the Descent pertains to the physical realm 226
For Man might through *posse non mori* have attained to *non posse mori* 226
Physical death a consequence of a prior psychical death . 227

CHAPTER XIV

The Fifth Article (*continued*)

The third day He rose again

The mystical meaning of the number *three* in the Bible . 229
Three is the signature of Divinity 230
Three, therefore, in connection with the Resurrection stamps it as a Divine event 231

PAGE
Difference of use between ἐγείρω and ἀνίστημι . . . 231
Immortality not an inherent right but an added gift . . 233
It, however, grows out of our Nature as its matter . . 233
But the power which bestows Immortality effects it by continuous action 234
Immortality of man cannot depend on physical resurrection of Jesus 235
Man's Immortality depends on the union of God and man . 236
The true meaning of 1 Cor. xv. 12-18 is mystical . . 237
The relation of this interpretation to "conditional immortality" 238
The difficulty this raises met by reincarnation. . . 239

CHAPTER XV

The Fifth Article (*continued*)

The third day He rose again (*continued*)

The main issue here is as to the nature of the Risen Life . 241
The mystery of the Risen Life 242
The mystery of superconsciousness illustrated by subconsciousness 243
The Risen Life is characterised by Love . . . 243
The Risen Life is, therefore, a life of Service . . . 244
The story of Emmaus sets out the Risen Life as a quest for Truth 246
But in this quest Intuition must come to the help of Reason 248
The Risen Life as a Life of Penitence 248
Penitence the seed-bed of Humility and disinterestedness . 249
The vision seen by Mary Magdalene adapted to a penitent . 250
The stages of enlightenment 251
The Risen Life and the Life of Contemplation . . 252
Contemplation as the exclusion of alien influences . . 253
The wounds in the body of Christ—their import . . 254
The double peace and the strength for service. . . 255
The Risen Life gives Understanding 256
The Risen Life and Life aeonian. 257
The shore of the Sea of Tiberias typical of Eternity . . 259

CHAPTER XVI

The Sixth Article—Part I

He ascended into Heaven

The Ascension part of the original evangel . . . 262
Variations as to its date 262

PAGE
The Ascension as a religious transaction . . . 263
More ascended than descended 263
Christ not the subject of Necessity but of Freedom . . 264
The Gnostic treatment of the Descent 265
Man's history as truly the history of a descent as of an ascent 266
Inadequacy of categories of Thought to set out truths of Religion 267
The use of the present tense proper to Mysticism . . 269
Descent and Ascent are related as Satan and Christ . . 271
The Ascension an integral part of the Life-story of Jesus . 272
And of the Life-story of the Disciple 272

CHAPTER XVII

The Sixth Article—Part II

He sitteth at the Right Hand of God the Father Almighty

The two keynotes of the Article are Authority and Worth . 274
The Authority is not of this world 275
Not exercised *ab extra* 275
Jesus has authority over all the activities of men . . 276
Industrial unrest in its purity springs from His Life . . 277
To still this unrest there is wanted a religious belief in God and the Soul 277
If the true Authority is rejected a false will usurp the throne 280
In State affairs if Jesus does not rule "Satan" steps in . 281
The Session at the right hand of God is the picturing of the Christian Ideal 283
"Reason" includes "values," but not so "Understanding" 284
The problem of the higher and the lower Self . . . 285
This illustrated by "self-control" 286

CHAPTER XVIII

The Seventh Article

From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead

Two allied facts here—the parousia and the judgment . 288
Nature of the figurative language of Holy Scripture . . 289
The mystical truth contained in the imagery of "clouds" . 290
Jesus coming in the "clouds" is a real coming . . 291
The force of the present tense here used . . . 292
The parousia spiritualised by the Fourth Evangelist . . 294

PAGE
The Second Coming is the Session made operative . . 294
His coming to the Soul gives the sense of " values " . . 295
The part played in our nurture by angels . . . 295
The object of the " coming " is judgment . . . 297
Judging is more than punishing ; it includes sifting of evidence, or testing 297
This testing is carried out in the events of daily life . . 298
" Quick and dead " has a moral, not a temporal meaning 300
Some illustrations of this fact from the N.T. itself . . 301

CHAPTER XIX

The Eighth Article

I believe in the Holy Ghost

The Article in its earliest form non-theological . . 305
Hence its value, first and last, is purely religious . . 306
The primitive Christian was conscious of being in touch with a heavenly Spirit 308
Having the Spirit the article of a standing or falling Church 309
Not action but " inaction " the test of greatness . . 310
The super-man is one who is great through the Spirit . 310
The high place of prophecy in the early Church . . 312
Present eclipse of the gifts of the Spirit . . . 314
Gifts of healing especially in evidence to-day . . . 316
The nature of the gift of tongues 317
The relation of the Spirit to the " world " . . . 319
The nature of the sin of which the " world " is convinced . 320
The work of the Spirit in inducing repentance . . 320
The question of what righteousness is before God . . 321
The nature of the " prince of this world " and his judgment 325

CHAPTER XX

The Ninth Article—Part I

The Holy Catholic Church

The heavenly nature of the Church in Hermas and 2 Clement 328
The similar teaching about the Church given by Gnostics . 331
Gnosticism and its traces in the N. T. 332
The Barbelo and the Valentinian systems . . . 336
The doctrine of Sophia in the Wisdom-literature . . 337
The Ecclesia is the community of " sons of the widow " . 337

PAGE
Gnostic teaching that Christos redeemed Sophia . . 338
One system introduces the " Fall " into the Pleroma. . 340
The religious side of Gnosticism 341
The key supplied by history fashioned in pre-Christian days 342
Gnostic " impieties " are really poetic parables . . 343
Early Christianity taught, therefore, an ideal not an empirical Church 345
The ideal Church is constitutive of State action . . 346
The empirical Church either one with the ideal Church or a civil institution 348
The relation between the empirical Church and the ideal Church 349
The steps by which the latter gave way to the former . 350
Infallibility and fanaticism related extremes 351
The folly of demanding perfection in any empirical Church . 352
The equal folly of solipsism 353

CHAPTER XXI

The Ninth Article—Part II

The Four " Notes " of the Church

The first of the " notes " to be emphasised was holiness . 356
Faith cannot hold these " notes " so far as they represent actualities 357
Hence the four Notes are notes of the ideal Church . . 358
Unity wrongly sought in the phenomenal order by Anglicans 358
The same error made by the Roman Church . . . 360
And also by the Orthodox Church of the East . . 361
Why the search for union on a phenomenal basis is futile . 362
Lotze on duality and contrast 363
Unity is not the negation of dualism but the subsumption of it 364
The unity given to thinking by conation the type of all union 365
Two meanings to the Biblical word " saint " . . . 366
The Church " holy " as consecrated to a " holy " end . 367
The Church of the Apostles' Creed is the ideal Church . 369
Frequently figured as a mountain or as " Jerusalem " . 369
The loss of the sense of ideality led to an ecclesiastical " holiness " 373
The term Catholic also is a term of art, importing ideality 374
The ecclesiastical use of " apostolic " 381
Ambiguity in the N.T. use of the word *apostle* . . 384
The Apostolic Church is the Church in the Heavens . . 386
The angels are its " apostles " 387

CHAPTER XXII

The Ninth Article—Part III

The Communion of saints

	PAGE
Six different meanings of this article possible	389
The meaning of the term κοινωνία	390
The Article a corollary to that of the Holy Ghost	391
Possession of the Spirit the condition of Church membership and not *vice versa*	392
The decay of Prophecy not wholly to be deplored	394
Communion with the saints departed	395
The witness of Faustus of Rhegium	396
The historical antecedents to the cult of the departed: (*a*) the distant date of the martyrs; (*b*) pagan cults of the dead; (*c*) the cult of heroes; (*d*) the popular belief in Immortality	397
The scientific basis for the cult of the departed	400
Communion in holy things is especially concerned with Baptism and Holy Communion	403
The Pagan origin of the form of Baptism, *e.g.* the Taurobolium	405
Many details of Catholic Baptism found also in Pagan	409
A form of blessing of oil	411
Summary of relations between Catholic and Pagan baptism.	411
The Eucharist not traceable to Judaism	412
The "eating of his God" a phrase abhorrent to the pious Jew	414
This phrase and its thing at home throughout Paganism	415
The syncretism of the beginning of our era a predisposing cause	416
St. John vi. is evidence for the pagan filiation	418
"My" is the distinctive word in "This is My Body"	419

CHAPTER XXIII

The Tenth Article

The Forgiveness of sins

The connection of "Forgiveness of sins" with Baptism	422
A higher and a lower conception of Forgiveness	423
The popular view of sins was that of uncleanness through contact with evil spirits	424
Water a general means of purification	424

PAGE
Some forms of exorcism 425
Supported by the Fathers 427
The higher view synchronous with the lower . . . 429
This makes forgiveness identical with union with God . 430
Illustrated by the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant . 430
And by that of the Prodigal Son 431
Forgiveness marks a passage from the psychical to the spiritual stage 431
Forgiveness of sins through " Penance " marks a declension 433
The mediaeval machinery of " Penance " 435
Indulgences an extra to that machinery 435

CHAPTER XXIV

The Eleventh Article

The Resurrection of the body

Originally this Article asserted the Resurrection of *this* flesh 438
The N.T. and the early Fathers at variance . . . 438
Influence of Egypt to be suspected 440
But native Egyptian thought further from Christian than was Alexandrian 441
Alexandrian thought leaned towards Orphism . . 442
The early Fathers dependent, directly or indirectly, on Persia 443
So also was Jewish apocalyptic belief 443
Different views about the nature of the Resurrection . 444
The service to Christianity rendered for a time by Chiliasm . 445
The Article of the Resurrection insists on the ultimate perfection of the whole man 446
It is hostile, therefore, to Puritanism 447
The difficulty caused by substantialising Soul . . . 449
The scholastic doctrine of the substantiality of the Soul . 450
The theory of the soul taught by William James . . 451
The psychological doctrine of the Self 452
The religious doctrine of the Soul 458
The Christian doctrine of newness implies the surrender of the Soul to the Spirit 460

CHAPTER XXV

The Eleventh Article (*continued*)

The Resurrection of the body (*continued*)

The uselessness of the concept of Soul as a *tertium quid* . 463
The modern doctrine of man's immortality . . . 464

PAGE
The implicates of the doctrine of Resurrection . . 466
The bearing on it of Gnostic thought 467
The conception of different kinds of bodies . . . 468
The development of a spiritual body out of the earthly . 471
This depends on the germinative principle of our permanent Self 471
What is the genesis of St. Paul's thought? . . . 473
Not Jewish or Persian or Greek or Indian, but Egyptian . 475
The doctrine of a re-embodiment in Egyptian religion . 476
The Judgment and Resurrection no necessary connection in time 479
The doctrine of an intermediate state 479
The doctrine of Reincarnation one form of this . . 479
Ten reasons for belief in the doctrine of Reincarnation . 481
Re-embodiment the genus of which Reincarnation is the species 495

CHAPTER XXVI

The Twelfth Article

Everlasting Life

The precise meaning of *αἰώνιος* 497
Its usage in the O. T. 497
Its usage in the N. T. 499
The Gnostic use of the term *aeon* 505
Some examples of the use of *aeon* in early Christian literature 510
The meaning of *ζωή* in the New Testament . . . 514
"Life" synonymous with "Faith" or "Kingdom of God" 515
The meaning of the phrase *believed on* Him . . . 517
Henri Bergson's teaching about Life 521
Conversion as the entrance on Life 523
On negative side it is the bursting the bonds of Self . . 526

Additional Note on the title "The Son of Man" . 529

APPENDIX—Some Forms of the Creed . . . 541

BIBLIOGRAPHY 549

INDEX 553

CHAPTER I

MYSTICISM AND TRADITION

THE problem of the Creed is but a special case of a larger problem—the problem of finding the true balance between any two given complementary forces. In this case the two forces are *freedom* and *authority*, the freedom of the individual and the authority of the community, where freedom is a function of life and authority of form. Hence the problem of the Creed may be stated as one form of the old problem how to reconcile life and form. The difficulty in finding the solution is due partly to the obscurity and complexity of the history which supplies the form, partly to the indeterminate character of the life with which we are concerned, viz. the life of religion, but principally to the imbecility of our human nature, which is apt to drive us either through impatience to despise the form, or through sloth to neglect the life.

This two-sided danger may be illustrated by the discredit into which the Apostles' Creed has fallen in the two rival camps of modern Christianity. Among Puritans it has ceased to enjoy any influence as a link binding the present with the past, or as a useful finger-post pointing the road to any Creed of the future. So much so that in recent controversies on the teaching of religion in elementary

schools the Apostles' Creed was rejected by the Puritanical bodies with substantial unanimity as being a denominational formula. As a form it secured little respect.

On the other hand, in the Roman and Anglican bodies the Creed as a form finds passionate defenders. Indeed, so devoutly is it as a form held to be sacrosanct that its champions are careless whether or not the Creed is accepted as a statement of personal religion, provided that it be maintained in honour as a symbol of orthodoxy. The consequence is that multitudes accept and recite their Creed without having the slightest intention of ordering their daily lives by its articles. They are content to know that their acceptance of the Creed supports their Church explicitly, and they trouble themselves very little about the implicits of the Creed itself. It is difficult to say whether it is at the hands of the Puritan or the Catholic that the Creed suffers the greatest indignity, for each by selecting arbitrarily one-half of the living child secures as a prize what has been killed in the process. Nowhere, and therefore not in the Creed, can we afford to dissociate life and form.

Fortunately there is a third way, and that is the way of the mystic, not of the one-sided but of the practical mystic, that is, of the genuine as against the spurious mystic. His position, stated briefly, is that he lives his Life and accepts the Form that is provided. His duty is first to listen to what the voice of his inner life bids him do, and then to make full use of the forms that tradition offers him. Stated in other terms, his imperative duty is to interpret for himself, and to maintain his right to interpret for himself, the credal forms which are

part of his birthright. To abnegate this right would be tantamount to an assertion either that the Spirit of God is not any longer at work in the hearts of believers, or that the Church has so failed in her historic mission as to have produced no disciples who can be trusted to walk by the Spirit. If the Catholic abhors both these alternatives he has no course open but to admit frankly the mystic's right to his private judgment, and not merely to admit, but to affirm and applaud it. For *ex hypothesi* the mystic is one who in some degree is under the Spirit, and the Creed is the product, it is claimed, of men who were led by the same Spirit. "Cuius regio eius religio" is surely a maxim of peculiar force here. The Spirit which created is the Spirit which has the right to interpret. Or are we to understand that bishops and priests, with theologians and doctors of canon law when duly summoned, are the sole depositaries of the interpretative Spirit? or else that the authorities who gave us our Creed were acting as statesmen and not as men of religion? If neither of these last two pleas is put in, then the right of every pious Christian to interpret his Creed for himself is unassailable, and any denial of this right on the part of ecclesiastical authority would be a mark of Anti-Christ. That that authority is showing nowadays less and less inclination to interfere with the right of the individual to interpret for himself is a hopeful sign of the times and a proof that the Christian spirit is slowly coming to its own.

Of course, however, authority has its legitimate and necessary place, for to it are entrusted the holding together of the community and its protection from one-sided, premature, or self-willed action on

the part of its members, or of groups of its members. For it is not the mystic or the prophet alone who may disturb Israel. But because of the importance of the half-truth committed to its care Authority should constantly keep in mind that the other half-truth has a right to free expression and growth. The prophet and the bishop must somehow keep on good terms, lest a St. Francis and a Savonarola sink to an Alexander and an Innocent.

But though it may not be difficult as a matter of fact to establish a *modus vivendi* between prophet and priest in the concrete, when there is good-will on both sides, or when one is so much stronger than the other as to compel an " ego vapulo, tu tantum pulsas," yet many will feel that the case is different where the two *principles* represented by prophet and priest are at issue. There, it will be urged by the priest, you have the truth of history as an established and unchallengeable datum. If the prophet, to quote Omar's argument, says what is in accordance with tradition his work is no doubt good, but it is superfluous ; if, on the other hand, he says what is opposed to it, he is *a priori* to be rejected as a false teacher. Moreover, the case is even worse with mysticism, seeing that under its corroding influence the truth of history is consumed, for if we are to hold, for example, that incarnation and crucifixion are mystical processes, then we are compelled to surrender them as historical events, or at all events as historical events of any potency. Though this objection disappears under close examination, yet it is held so widely, though it may be as a vague feeling rather than as a reasoned conviction, that it may be worth while to point out that both the mystical and the historical principle

may be true at once and that no necessary contradiction exists between a process and an event.

But let us first try to see clearly what the objection really is. It may be said to start from the conflict of two forces whose activity is known empirically, even though our intellect is powerless to explain the ground of their interaction. *Theologically*, the opposition is between the views known as Pantheism and as Theism. The former (better called with Hegel, *acosmism*) sees an underlying, ever active immaterial Presence at work in everything. It is the unitary substratum in which all processes and all moments inhere, from which they spring and to which they return. As the *anima mundi*, it inspires and moves our universe, and as the great cosmic unknowable Energy it vivifies all worlds. Persons, things, and events come and go, but they are each and all nothing more than a twinkling of the eye of the Eternal, which persists unchanged, unmoved, while they for a brief moment flit across the stage and then return to the nothingness which gave them birth.

Theism, on the other hand, shrinks back appalled before the abyss thus opened up by Pantheism, for it sees clearly enough that a thorough-going Pantheism leaves no room for any permanence of any Form, and, therefore, cuts at the tap-root of all noble individualism. If I am but a bubble on the stream of Time, a dewdrop whose fate is to slip into the ocean of Being and leave no trace, then why encourage any hope or striving for that which is more than human? Why not eat and drink, or otherwise enjoy ourselves, before the long night comes? But does not something within which is more than racial vanity testify to the enduring

worth of the individual, and forbid him to be content with a Creed which makes the world a machine and man a cog in it? It is these restless questionings which give to Theism its hold over men's minds, and prevent them from resting in an explanation of the world which explains man out of it by denying him that property of enduringness which gives him all his spiritual and moral worth.

Again, *philosophically*, the same open conflict meets us in the hypotheses known as psycho-physical parallelism on the one hand and the Soul[1] on the other. The former appears under two forms. It says either that physical and psychical happenings are two aspects of one recondite Reality behind them both, and that it has no idea what is the relation between the two sets of happenings; or it says, reversing Huxley's dictum, that the psychical is the Reality and that it is the physical which is the "epiphenomenal." In either case, it is urged, all things, whether without or within, are sufficiently explained as objects of an all-sweeping law of mechanism. On the other hand, those who uphold the commonsense and scholastic doctrine of the Soul, and refuse "a psychology without a soul," do so on grounds which are similar to the implicits of Theism. They maintain that the facts of introspective psychology demand something more than an account of them as "streams of consciousness," that, on the contrary, there is a unitary being, or thing, or "substance," which is the ground of personality, and serves (among many other things) to give individuality to those "streams of consciousness," which we have got into the habit

[1] For a discussion on the meaning of the term *soul* see under Chapter XXIV.

of calling "*I.*" In other words, the Soul is reinstated in its ancient position as the unifying ground of individual consciousness as against some psycho-physical thing which fails to preserve the right to independent existence of the Ego.

Now the same opposition which meets us in theology as between Pantheism and Theism, in philosophy between mechanicalism and spiritualism, meets us in *symbolics* between mysticism and tradition. And the reason is the same in all three, and the way out is the same. The reason of the conflict in all three is that we are faced in them with a natural dualism which apparently refuses to be merged into any larger unity attainable by our intellect. The way out of the conflict is by the frank acceptance *by life* of the truths of both disputants as being necessary to any sane and true course of conduct.

Thus Tradition (which may be regarded as the analogue of Theism, and of psycho-physical parallelism in either of its two forms) and Mysticism (which corresponds to Pantheism and to the doctrine of the Soul) are not contradictory but complementary truths. For mysticism sees the world as the manifestation of a process out of Time, which, therefore, knows of no time-divisions, or space-separations, but is always there and always at work. And consequently, the mystic's aim is to rise out of a life of change and becoming into the Life which is life indeed. But *ex hypothesi*, that Life is here and now, and needs not to be located in the past, or to be sought for through the medium of spatial conceptions, but is given as a force which is present. Hence mysticism seems to deny, or to ignore, or at least to run the risk of passing by the historical as

comparatively worthless, and hence ecclesiastical authorities as the Keepers of tradition have always watched with suspicious eye the rising of every new mystic star.

On the other side, the champion of tradition who appeals to sure facts of history—always assuming, of course, that his facts are sure—must admit that it is not the historical fact alone which is the base of his Creed. For, to take but one example, tens of thousands of unhappy men have been crucified by the cruelty of man who have left no record and exercised no known influence on subsequent ages. The eternal Something was not sufficiently creative in their case to call for remembrance. Hence it is not the historical fact as such which is critical, but something which energises through the fact, and it is that energising thing which forms the ground on which the so-called historical religion is builded up. But that inner Life is the very thing on which the mystic relies, and, therefore, it seems to follow that the fight between mysticism and historical dogma is a logomachy rather than a real conflict of principle.

The conflict, where there is one, may be stated thus: Subjective faith believes that religion is found in the process only; the believer in the historical holds that it is found in the event only. Eliminate the falsehood contained in the word *only*, and it would seem that no necessary opposition is left. That caution is necessary in admitting the grounds on which an exclusive proposition is accepted is a fact of everyday experience. For example, it has been argued that the law of the Conservation of Energy is of universal sweep, and, therefore, excludes the soul as a source or bestower

of force, because our universe is a closed universe. This rests on the assumptions that our world is the *only* world there is, and that its laws are all capable of being stated in terms of mechanics *only*, and hence that there is no place left for Soul.

But it is just the true mystic and also the profound student of history who would reject equally the propositions that religion is found in the process only, or in the event only. Both agree that "*both-and*" is a better formula than "*either-or*," and that religion, therefore, is to be looked for both in the process and in the event. Just as in the world of electricity the power requires both the connecting wires (the process) and the lamps (the event) before it can light our streets, so the Life we call Religion must have its continuous, unperceived process as well as the formulation of that process in those moments of manifestation which we call events. Or to take another illustration which comes from a sphere nearer to that of religion. Whatever may be the mysteries which still veil the soul from the philosopher commonsense philosophy agrees that the soul is a material or immaterial something in which inheres a continuous life, and that this life as a process emerges at every instant out of the dark unconscious and takes form in the actions of which all may take note. That soul should subsist without manifesting itself in formal acts, or that actions, on the other hand, should come from nowhere, and have no process behind them are equally incredible propositions.

These considerations should be sufficient to warn us of the danger of setting mystic-process and historical-event over against one another as mutually exclusive. Indeed, so far from incarnation,

for example, as a continuous process excluding incarnation as a supreme event, it may rather be said that a supreme act of incarnation presupposes and rests on a process by which incarnation is daily in activity. So far from crucifixion as a historical event excluding a mystic process known as the mystic crucifixion, it is more true to say that without the process the historical crucifixion is emptied of its content. Similarly, the truth of the resurrection of the body depends on a prior process of resurrection out of the body—the dying daily must precede the final act by which a man dies to the world. And ascension to the right hand of God would be naturally incongruous, and so impossible, to anybody who had not first gone through the mystic process of fixing his mind on the things which are above. Every separate act which we call holy is but the material form of a spiritual process or state known as holiness.

One serious objection of principle may be urged against this view. It may be said that our argument assumes without proof that the laws of the spiritual life are capable of formulation in the same way that the laws of the physical world are capable of formulation, and that this assumption is fatal to Religion, seeing that its essence is to be found in the recognition of a Power or Powers more than human, whose ways are inscrutable, and, therefore, not to be brought under any formula of law or logic. It would be better, therefore, to be content with the venerable doctrine which has served us so long, even though it be also a mere assumption, viz. that the great events of the Christian Creed are miracles, in the sense that they do not come under any law, known or unknown, but are direct acts

of God which do not come under our law of causality, but spring from the fiat of God's will and refuse to be co-ordinated, or systematised, or in any way explained by reason.

1. To this objection we would reply, firstly, that the argument proves too much and in so doing proves nothing. If it is sound it rules out as impertinent all discourse about religious things, all sermons, theological works, works on Christian evidences, indeed the objection itself. For as the objection is a logical proposition about a subject which it affirms is extra-logical it is as futile and impertinent as the proposition against which it is levelled. Indeed, it may be justly described as religiously vicious, inasmuch as it excludes mind from the jurisdiction of religion, and enjoins on it a mere passive indifference to the stimuli it calls "miracles." Seeing, however, that it is a familiar property of the Soul (of which Mind is one function) not merely to be an inert field for sensations but to co-operate creatively in reacting to stimuli so as to produce sensation, what ground have we for supposing that a different law prevails where Religion is concerned? In Religion, it is generally agreed, a similar process takes place as in the sensory world. For the Soul is again acted on by stimuli which come not now from the outer or lower world, but from the inner or higher world. Why should it be assumed that the soul is merely passive to these any more than she is to the stimuli of the sensory world? It is true that a great Master bids us be "active to the things without and passive to the things within," but this passivity so far from being inertness is rather the highest form of activity, being comparable to that repose which Ruskin has

reminded us is but Power gathered up for supreme action. Passive no doubt the soul is before the coming of its God in the sense that it puts forward nothing of its own to hinder His approach, but this very passivity, or receptiveness, involves the highest possible inhibitory activity. So far, therefore, from the Soul being reduced to impotence before the miraculous it is raised to its highest potency in thought, feeling and will. Its thought, or its reason, is exalted, not annihilated. The worship which, it is urged, is the only proper reply of the soul to the miraculous is not a worship emptied of all logical content, but a worship where thought is at its highest, seeing that the object before it is one which stirs, as nothing else can, the whole Soul to its depths with its feelings, volitions and thoughts.

2. But a still stronger reply to the objection is found when we observe that it is based on a failure to discriminate between the miraculous as a *Ding-an-sich* and the miraculous as a phenomenon, between the Power which as such is a hidden, unknown and perhaps unknowable thing, and the Power which voluntarily offers itself within our field of vision, and *so far* invites us to put forth our best endeavours to understand it. No proposition receives a more general assent than that which affirms that the root of things is unknowable, unless it be a second proposition which affirms that the whole field of the phenomenal, psychical as well as physical, is a subject proper for reason to deal with. But if everything at its roots is a mystery, inviting to wonder and worship rather than to comprehension, if " omnia exeunt in mysterium," then the birth of a child is as much miraculous as the birth

of a world or as the birth of the Son of God. On the other hand, His incarnation, while as a process it is beyond reason, moving to worship rather than to enquiry, yet as a fact in history it is as much a proper object for reason as is the life of Lord Nelson, or the sociology of the bee.

The interpretation, therefore, which starts from assuming in the Creed a mystical order no more banishes necessarily the Divine activity or cuts at the root of worship than the current method of interpretation which also assumes a hidden Power and an overt act, or series of acts of the Power. For both assert that the Power is known only in its manifestations, and that the sum-total of its manifestations, moreover, so far from exhausting the Power, form in all probability but an infinitesimal fraction of its hidden reserves. Where they differ is in the emphasis they lay on the relative importance of the two factors, the mystic and the historical, and in the nature of the factor called here " mystic."

Those who set out to interpret the Creeds in the form generally current trouble themselves as a rule very little about the mystical background of the Creeds. They start from the assumption that certain events are as events miraculous, and therefore exceptional, and then proceed to explain dogmatically or historically the various articles affirming those events. Taking the miraculousness of the event as a datum which does not lend itself to discussion, except so far as the evidence for it may be assailed by criticism, they are content to dismiss the mystical which lurks behind the history, as a vague and shadowy thing which can only cause confusion. In taking this line, it is right to point

out, they cannot expect to escape the criticism that they are adopting the same methods and displaying the same spirit as those numerous men of science and philosophy who have discarded the Soul in their natural history of man, made him for simplicity's sake a mere machine, and given us a "psychology without a soul." To omit the mystic background of the Creed may secure clearness and precision, just as a mechanistic explanation of the world is more level to ordinary understanding than a spiritual explanation, but it gives us an object without depth and without life. It is the play of *Hamlet* with Hamlet left out.

The mystic interpretation of the Creed, on the other hand, insists that the mystic process lying behind the whole is as the life of which the historical events form the body. For convenience' sake you may dissect the body from which the life has fled through the process of abstraction, but if you are to do justice to the Creed you must restore to it its life, or at all events impress on your students that they must reconstruct it in imagination as a living whole—with the life informing the body—if it is to subserve the uses of religious life. It may be that this method of interpretation is caviare to the general, that it will not commend itself to any but a prepared number, but this if anything is a reason why it should receive more, rather than less, respectful attention. As we climb the mountain of life we see further as we mount higher, and our number is smaller as we progress. But this is but a reason why those at lower levels should trust the reports of those on higher levels. To reject them on the ground that they cannot be made to fit in with the more partial geography of the valley is the blunder

of those who will only believe what they see, or act when they fully understand.

3. A third reply to the objection, of less value, but in some quarters of more efficacy, may be stated and then left. It is that in dealing with the Creed as a thing with a mystic soul and a physical body we are but doing what every orthodox writer on the Creed does. He postulates a miraculous base and a historical building, and proceeds to examine the historical with the object of illustrating the concealed Power which has projected it in space and time. Whether it is Caspari collecting all the documentary evidence, or Kattenbusch discussing the diffusion of Creeds, or Harnack or Loofs, or Clemen, or Zahn, or Burn, or Sanday settling moot points, all are content to deal with the phenomenal and to postulate the real behind it. They do not attempt to reduce this Real under law, but only its manifestations. Similarly, here we make no attempt to limit or fetter the mystical life by an intellectual process, but are content to suggest the meaning of the articles of the Creed as they stand, on the assumption that they mask living processes of the life of the Spirit.

One point of difference no doubt exists between the method of the ordinary expositor of the Creed and that of the mystical interpreter, which consists in the different values assigned to tradition. The former is content to explore and state the opinions held by men whose position or character entitles them to exceptional consideration, while the latter is disposed to emphasise the greater importance of each individual, whatever his worth, approaching the subject from his own peculiar standpoint. The one dwells on the testimony of an Athanasius, a

Clement, an Augustine, and where they all agree, on their unassailable authority; the other listens respectfully to the authority, and then takes the liberty of deciding for himself. But this difference of method must not be allowed to blind us to the fact that orthodox expositor and mystic interpreter agree in holding that their subject-matter shows the same characteristic, viz. that it is the material manifestation of a hidden Power, the only difference being that the one regards the working of this Power as exceptional or miraculous, and the other as orderly and continuous.

If it be objected further that mystics such as Tauler, Eckhart, Boehme and George Fox all shared the orthodox belief of their day, and therefore took as the base of their thought the miraculous on which Christianity was considered to be built, we reply firstly that they did this as theologians, or as men of unquestioning piety, and not as mystics; and secondly, that in so far as they were mystics they tended to belittle or to ignore, or to emasculate the miraculous as such, by almost unconsciously transmuting it into the hidden, continuous, uniform working of the eternal Father. When, for example, the *Theologia Germanica* (chap. iii.) says that Adam's fall "was because of his claiming something for his own, and because of his I, Mine, Me and the like," that "had he eaten seven apples, and yet never claimed anything for his own, he would never have fallen"; and then finds the remedy in the Incarnation of God, while adding: "Now if God took to Himself all men that are in the world, or ever were, and were made man in them, and they were made divine in Him, and this work were not fulfilled in me, my fall and my

wandering would never be amended except it were fulfilled in me also," is it not made abundantly clear that the thought of the unknown author is more universalistic in its scope and individualistic in its application than disposed to make much of the miraculous as such or to give paramount place to the authority of tradition ? Mysticism is always individualistic because it lays stress on life, and because it lays stress on life it makes more of its underlying oneness than of its phenomenal variety.

CHAPTER II

THE MYSTICAL BASE OF CHRISTIANITY

Before proceeding to enquire into the mystical meaning of the Creed in detail a few general considerations call for some discussion in order that the Creed as a whole may be properly appreciated. And the first point to be noticed is its place in history—its place as a whole, that is to say, and not the story of its separate articles. We are not concerned with the dispute whether the origin of the Creed is to be sought in the East rather than in the West; whether it grew gradually, or in the main was the work of one generation, one Church, or one brain; with the dates at which various additions were made to the number of its articles; or with the vicissitudes of its history as a baptismal document. A much more important question than all these put together demands an answer of some sort at our hands, and an answer must be given, even if it be one to which not certainty but some compelling degree of probability only attaches.

That question is: Did Christianity emerge as a religion of a mystical character and afterwards take a historical setting, or, on the other hand, did it from the beginning declare itself to be of an institutional character with prescribed rites, a prescribed cult, with appointed officers, and definite

laws, and precise outlines at least of organisation, with the intent that out of acceptance of all or some of these the mystic life might in due time take its rise ?

In answer to this question it might be urged *a priori* that as in general function precedes the organ, so the Christian life, if this rule is to hold good, preceded its institutions. But to this a rejoinder, based also on *a priori* grounds, might be made to the effect that we know nothing of the beginnings of anything, but only of the course of its development, and that the history of the development of any object or event finds its life and its form already there as *data* for the enquiry, and that therefore all attempt to settle their precedence is futile.

While admitting, however, that this rejoinder has some plausible cogency, it may be pointed out that it conceals the fallacy of the undistributed middle. Life and form, the argument runs, always face us as things given ; life and form lie at the origins of Christianity ; therefore the life and the form of Christianity must be taken as coeval. The fallacy lies in the ambiguous use of the term *form*. *Form* in the major premiss means form in general, but in the minor premiss it means the *particular* form which the enquirer thinks is what he finds at the threshold. As a matter of fact, it is difficult, if not impossible, to say what, if any, is the form of cult, creed, or organisation displayed by the earliest history of Christianity. So far from any fixed form meeting us, what does really occur is a series of kaleidoscopic changes where nothing continues in one stay.

We are forced, therefore, to come down from the

heights of *a priori* reasoning to the broad highway of history, and observe as best we may the facts as they pass by. When we do this, one or two things become clearer.

In the first place, we are barred from adopting the method of proof adopted by some writers (*e.g.* by Bishop Gore in his work on the *Christian Ministry*) which finds an existing order in a select period (say the fourth century), which then proceeds to give a selection of facts of an earlier date, and finally asks whether the consistency of these facts with the selected forms found at a later date does not give reasonable proof that these forms go as far back as the cited facts. For it is forgotten that the very facts which support the proof may have come into the Church from outside sources, and in that case are as much proofs of the sensitive pliability of the early Church as of the uniformity of her traditions.

In the second place, recent research [1] has proved as convincingly as anything can be proved that so far from Christianity arising from an exclusive and closed system of truth in the midst of surrounding error, it is more true to say that its roots ran deep into contemporary life, and that there was little that was new in it, except the higher life which came down to earth in the person of its Founder. But in saying this we are almost unconsciously laying bare the essence of Christianity, for it too is not life only, nor form only, but, like everything else, *life in form*. The life is that of the Christ who came

[1] A good example of the strides made by recent research into the origins of Christianity is afforded by a comparison of the article on Gnosticism in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* with that on the same subject in the last edition.

both as the Revealer of ancient truth and as the Giver of a new life.[1] But the form was already provided in the ethnic beliefs and customs of the day, and this form, like all forms, was plastic, and as a matter of fact has never ceased from changing, not even during the vulgarly supposed changelessness of the Middle Age, and is changing more rapidly to-day perhaps than ever before.

If it is urged that Christianity bears every mark of having been originally a growth inside Judaism before it underwent a process of "acute Hellenisation," and that therefore it is illegitimate to seek to explain its origins from outside Judaism, we reply that at the beginning of our era Judaism itself had yielded to the eclectic movement which was the dominant intellectual force in the Roman Empire between the death of Alexander the Great and the birth of Jesus Christ, and had opened its doors to every religious impulse which was to be found between India and Spain. So far, then, from the fact that Christianity appeared as an off-shoot from Judaism being any proof of its exclusive character it is much more a proof to the contrary. Judaism had become the host of all the speculations of all the existing religions, and these it sought to cover by the worship of the one God, its θεὸς ὕψιστος,[2] and to compel into a formal unity by the rigidity with which it made its national life the groundwork of its synagogue organisation. Like the Roman Church of to-day, it was blandly tolerant of any creed which did not threaten any danger

[1] For Messianic expectations among the Samaritans, Romans, Persians, and in the Sybillines, see Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 1903, pp. 211-213.

[2] Cf. W. F. Cobb, *Note on Αἰών and Ὕψιστος*, 1912 (Donnison & Son).

to its organisation, or its claim to be the exclusive bearer of salvation through its Messiah or through its Torah. As Bousset says, "For the work of the Christ Judaism paved the way; nor must we forget that its preparatory work included the taking up into itself of essential elements of foreign religions, and the working them over to some extent. Not one religion only has contributed to the growth of Christianity, but it was due to an intermingling of the religions of the western world of culture, the period of Hellenistic culture. Alexander the Great had to come and build the Hellenistic Empire; the amalgamation of national cultures from the Euphrates and Tigris to Alexandria and Rome must begin so as to create the conditions antecedent to the becoming of Christianity. Judaism was the crucible into which the different elements were thrown together. Then there followed through a creative miracle the new creation which is the Gospel." [1]

So far, then, is Judaism from having the honour of being the sole parent of Christianity and of imposing on its child the independent laws of its own being that it itself has no title to be regarded as essentially different from the other religions of the early Empire, except so far as it was held more tenaciously than the rest by reason of the stubborn racial self-consciousness of its devotees.

But a still more significant feature of early Christianity remains to be considered. *Christianity at first was a secret, mystery-religion.* For the first three hundred years of its existence it was not a

[1] Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 1903, p. 493; with this Harnack agrees, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung*, 1902, p. 11.

religio licita. It was condemned by the Jewish authorities as vigorously as by the Empire, and both united, according to the Gospel story, in putting its Founder to death. Its doctrine was secret, for to its disciples alone were the " mysteries of the kingdom " given clearly, while to others they were given in parabolic form only. It used familiar mystery-terms for its rites; its baptism was a φωτισμός, and it gave a *seal* (σφραγίς), both terms being derived from the mysteries. Baptism was a *mystery* (μυστήριον), and it was described as a μύησις, or τελετή, or τελείωσις, all mystery-terms. " The purified crowd at Eleusis saw a blaze of light, and in the light were represented in symbol life and death and resurrection." Lights, crowns, the use of milk and honey, and fasting are characteristic alike of Christian baptism and mystery-initiations. The influence of the mysteries on the Eucharist was later than their influence on baptism, if we may judge from the scattered references to the latter in early days, but it was none the less certain.[1] Even the rites themselves bore so suspicious a likeness to those of the cult of Mithras that Tertullian was driven to adopt the explanation that the devil as a " simia Dei " had copied and taught the Christian mysteries before they came into existence.

Christianity had also its " traditio Symboli," which was denied to the uninitiated, just as other mystery-religions had their secret signs and passwords known to the initiates only. Not before Baptism was the creed given, and similarly

[1] See Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1891, pp. 292-309; also Cheetham, *The Mysteries Pagan and Christian*, 1897, in which Dr. Hatch's conclusions are questioned.

the Lord's Prayer was withheld till the first Communion.[1]

Its meetings were held in secret, in an upper room,[2] in some place inaccessible to the general public, according to Pliny, for he was dependent for his evidence on the admissions extorted from the Christians themselves; in the catacombs, where the worshippers concealed themselves from the police under the disguise of a burial-guild. This was true not only of the Christians of Rome but throughout the Empire. Such a guild would not consist in all probability of more than a hundred members, and where the Christians were numerous the difficulty was met by forming separate guilds.[3]

Moreover, the canonical scriptures of the early Church contain innumerable expressions and allusions to mystery, or Gnostic theology—the two for our present purpose are undistinguishable, and among them the following seem to demand the serious attention of those who maintain that Christianity stands or falls with any given account of its historical birth and growth.

[1] Bonwetsch in *Realencyk. für prot. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1897, ii. p. 55. The presence of mystery-terms and conceptions in the Church of the fourth century is generally admitted; Zahn and Kattenbusch admit it in the third century; Roman writers naturally prefer a still earlier date. The truth probably is that Christianity from the very first contained the seeds of all later developments, and that these seeds would spring up or lie latent according as the conditions were favourable or unfavourable. As the essence of Christianity is to be found in the Person and Life of Jesus Christ, it becomes a question of secondary importance whether His life borrowed its forms from Judaism alone.

[2] Acts i. 13; cf. Matt. x. 27.

[3] "Les Chrétiens eurent recours à l'organisation en collèges funéraires afin de mettre la loi de leur côté, bien loin d'avoir désormais à la redouter. Sous le nom de *collegia funeraticia* ou de *collegia tenuiorum* les chrétiens arrivent donc à vivre au grand jour et à posséder des cimetières. La préfecture urbaine ayant reçu les déclarations requises, chaque collège fonctionne régulièrement." Cabrol, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne*, iv. 2421.

(*a*) "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given." [1] The teaching of Jesus is therefore esoteric, and this is emphasised in the repeated warning, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." [2] "'Tis the taught already that profits by teaching" is Browning's statement of the same mystic truth, and "unto every one that hath shall be given" [3] is another.

(*b*) "Where two or three have been brought together into My name there am I in the midst of them." When compared with the *Logion* found in 1897: Saith Jesus, "Wheresoever there be two they are not godless; and where there is one only, I say, I am with him. Raise up the stone, and there thou shalt find Me: cleave the tree, and there am I," the inference seems inevitable that "in the midst of them" is the equivalent of "within you" in Luke xvii. 21, and affirms that the Christ is the "Dweller in the Innermost" of the disciple. The being "brought together" must then be interpreted of the mystic conversion of the individual by which he passes from being enrolled into the name of the Devil into being enrolled into the name of the Christ. The appeal is not addressed to a group, nor even to the outer side of the individual, but to his deeper self.

(*c*) "Every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; but he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." [4] This is demonstrably untrue if its limits are those of the present dispensation; and therefore humbling or exalting in the present order will, it is said, be met by exalting or humbling in

[1] Matt. xiii. 11.
[2] Matt. xiii. 43, Luke xiv. 35.
[3] Matt. xxv. 29.
[4] Luke xviii. 14, Matt. xxiii. 12.

the spiritual order. But this contrast is quite in the Gnostic style.

(*d*) The title "Son of the Man" can be explained only by means of the Gnostic figure of the Heavenly Man to whom by regeneration the disciple is transferred.[1]

(*e*) The fixing of regeneration and conversion as the beginning of the Christian life [2] is in accord with Gnostic teaching.[3]

(*f*) "Many last ones shall be first and first last" [4] can mean nothing but that the great ones of this world will be least in the spiritual world, and *vice versa*, just as in the Magnificat, Luke i. 52, 53. This is made clear in Mark x. 31, where it is expressly said that the poor and despised of this age shall in the coming aeon receive aeonian life.

(*g*) The frequent occurrence of the number three as a symbolical number, as in the three days of Luke ii. 46, Matt. xv. 32, the three measures of meal of Matt. xiii. 33, the three disciples of Matt. xvii. 1, xxvi. 37, the third day of Matt. xvi. 21, and of Luke xiii. 32, the three tabernacles of Mark ix. 5, the three loaves of Luke xi. 5, the three years of Luke xiii. 7, compel almost a ranging of this "three" with the Gnostic use of the same number.[5]

[1] Cf. Lietzmann, *Der Menschensohn*, 1896, and Tract No. 1 of the "Society of Disciples," *The Title "Son of Man"* (Headley Brothers), 1908.

[2] Matt. xviii. 3, Luke xxii. 32, John iii. 3.

[3] See Hippol. *Ref. of all Her.* v. 3 *passim*.

[4] Matt. xix. 30.

[5] "They represent all material substance to be formed from three passions, viz. fear, grief, and perplexity" (Irenaeus, *Ante-Nic. Christian Liby.* Bk. I. v. 4). "They conceive of three kinds of men, spiritual, material, and animal, represented by Cain, Abel, and Seth" (*ibid.* I. vii. 5). So Hippolytus: "They divide ('Adam') as Geryon into three parts. For, they say, of this man one part is rational, another psychical, another earthly" (*Ref.* v. chap. i.).

(*h*) " ' Called ' are many, but ' elect ' are few " [1] makes use of two Gnostic technical terms for their second and third degrees of spiritual development.

(*i*) " The Way " as a technical term (equivalent to the " Path " of Buddhism), in Acts ix. 2, xix. 9, 23, xxii. 4, xxiv. 14 (add John xiv. 4-6, 2 Peter ii. 15),[2] points to an esoteric body of teaching and mode of life and to a secret brotherhood.

(*j*) The use of the word *αἰών* or *αἰώνιος* to denote, not time indefinitely prolonged, but life out of time, and frequently the personal ruler of timeless realms, as, *e.g.*, in Ephes. ii. 2, 1 Tim. i. 17, Col. i. 25, 1 Cor. ii. 7, Heb. xi. 3, Ephes. iii. 11, Gal. i. 4.[3]

It may be convenient to sum up the question at issue in this chapter in a series of axiomatic propositions which will be affirmed (or denied) by all partisans, but will be no doubt accorded some respectful attention by all who put truth before party.

1. Two creeds, or philosophies of life, have been contending for centuries, due to an optimist and pessimist disposition respectively, which may for convenience' sake be described as Greek and Semitic.

2. The latter emphasises the transcendence of God, depreciates the worth of the visible world, regards man as corrupted, and upholds a miraculous system of mediation.

3. The former emphasises the immanence of

[1] Matt. xxii. 14.

[2] These texts are an authority for treating as technical also the use of the term *Way* in Ps. cxix., Matt. v. 25, vii. 14, xxii. 16, John x. 1, Prov. (15 times). The *ladder* of Jacob's vision in xxviii. 12 should probably be rendered *Way*.

[3] Cf. W. F. Cobb, *Note on Αἰών*, 1912 (Donnison & Son). See also Chapter XXV., below.

God, exalts the visible world as being sacramental, regards man as of one substance with God, and in place of miracle teaches an eternal Pilgrimage.

4. Both systems rest on Faith, not on Reason.

5. Their opposition is set in sharp contrast by their interpretation of the term "Father" as applied to God.

6. The modern representative of the pessimist creed is Catholicism or Puritanism.

7. The optimist creed is represented by Plato, Philo, the Gnostics, Origen, Plotinus, the Arabian Philosophy, the mediaeval sects of Paulicians, Cathari, Patarines, Waldenses, etc., the Gottesfreunde and other mediaeval mystics, the Cambridge Platonists and the Quakers. The Renaissance and the Reformation aided this creed negatively rather than positively.

8. The central truth of the optimist creed is the divine nature of the soul as a Fünklein of the Eternal Light; this implies its pre-existence and deathlessness. This creed also implies that the Soul is united with a material form in order to enable it to become an individual fit for an enriched life in the Heavens.

9. The pessimist creed is the creed of the majority by the nature of things; hence it has on its side the forces of Conservatism, of the order established for the time being, of the State, and of the Church in alliance with the State.

10. From this it follows that leaders of the optimist creed when strong enough to excite opposition are obnoxious to the physical forces at the disposal of the established order, and are therefore visited with ostracism, obloquy, banishment, prison, or death.

11. The responsibility for these acts of violence rests on the community from time to time as a whole whose organs are social custom and feeling, the authority of the State, and the authority of the Church.

12. That the pessimist creed is opposed by nature to the optimist is shown by the fate under different conditions of Socrates, Hypatia, Jesus Christ, the main body of early Christian martyrs, Jeanne d'Arc, John Huss, Giordano Bruno, Madame Guyon, Eckhart, the Bohemian Brothers, the Quakers.

13. One result of the violence to which the champions of religious humanism have been subjected has been the formation of Secret Societies for common propaganda, with authoritative secret signs and pass-words.

14. Such Secret Societies were the primitive Christians, the heretical sects so called of the Middle Age, and Freemasons' Lodges.

15. These all taught a Brotherhood, because those who feel they are united under one Father regard every society founded on the basis of one Fatherhood as a family.[1]

16. This accounts for la liberté, fraternité, égalité, of the French Revolution, and demands to-day sympathy with all movements which promise the individual, whether man or woman, similar freedom of self-expression, brotherly treatment, and equality of opportunity.

17. The course of development from pessimism

[1] Cf. "And when they have become Christians they call them (the slaves) brethren without hesitation . . . for they do not call them brethren according to the flesh but according to the spirit and in God" (Aristides, *Apology*, 15).

to optimism is from Fear through Dependence to Love. In the first stage, a transcendental God is feared as being hostile or offended; in the second, His transcendence passes into Immanence; in the third, the two are harmonised through Love.

CHAPTER III

THE NATURE OF MYSTICISM

Although in the previous chapter we have affirmed that in the interpretation of the Creed we ought to proceed on the ground of the priority both in time and in value of the mystical element over the historical, yet we have not so far given any definition of what is meant by mysticism. And it is the more incumbent on us to do this because of the ambiguity of the term.

Mysticism in its negative aspect is the appeal of the soul of man against the formalism of life and the blurring of ideals, especially when these are enthroned in organised Churches. Whenever established cults fail to voice the religious consciousness of their day, or to secure by their superior spirituality the confidence of the people they profess to guide and to teach, when they sink into formalism ethically or intellectually, then mysticism raises its head in public. It was so in the days when Socrates sought to divert the Athenians from the study of nature to the study of man; when Plato by dialogues which were half-philosophical, half-poetical, and wholly mystical, offered a substitute for the decaying official religion; when Jesus Christ came to make the dead bones of Paganism live; when Neo-Platonism opposed the

rationalism of the growing Catholic Church, and Dionysius was introduced to vivify the Western Church weary of dialectics; when in turn there stood up a Francis, an Abbot Joachim, an Eckhart, a Tauler, a Suso, a Richard Hampole, a Molinos, a Pascal, a Madame Guyon, a George Fox, and a goodly company of prophets of the spirit. It might almost be said that a strong and vigorous mysticism of whatever kind when ranged against established religious bodies is a presumption of their deadness in whatever age it occurs.

Mysticism, again, following on the same lines, is often the name given by philosophic thought to any attempt to find God by other methods than those proper to Reason.[1] The somewhat arrogant claim to equate Being with Thought, or to regard Reason exclusively or principally as the one instrument by which we escape from Nature to Nature's God, is a claim which can but arouse other powers in the soul to make active protest, and these when they find expression are set on one side contemptuously as "mystical."

Or *mystical* is treated as synonymous with feeling, as if feeling could ever be apart from thought. What is probably meant is not that feeling is formless but that its selective function in determining what objects the soul shall take interest in has been allowed to hurry it to conclusions without the steadying criticism of the Reason, and then mysticism is used as a term of reproach. For examples, Vaughan[2] says that "Rationalism overrates reason, formalism action, and mysticism feeling," which makes mysticism nothing but feeling run to seed.

[1] Récéjac, *The Bases of the Mystic Knowledge*, p. 7.
[2] *Hours with the Mystics*, Bk. I. chap. ii.

A special case of this "mystic feeling" is to be found in the attitude of great poets to Nature, of which Wordsworth may be taken as the type; it forms an interesting chapter in Dean Inge's *Bampton Lectures* on *Christian Mysticism*, but in so far as it is a natural mood of insight, of rapture, and of the fusion in feeling of subject and object, it hardly comes under the head of mysticism proper. At its lowest it is an empty reverie or idle day-dream.

Sometimes mysticism is treated as springing from an intellectual immediacy of apprehension of God, as if the soul in addition to its better known faculties of sensation, perception, apperception, conation, etc., had yet another as the crown of them all, to which is given the name of intuition, and as if, further, the act or habit of putting trust in this crowning faculty was rightly designated as mysticism. We are not concerned here with the truth or otherwise of our possessing such a special faculty; all we have to point out is that by itself it is not properly mysticism at all.

Dr. Caldecott defines Mysticism as a method of founding religious belief in which "analysis of religious faith is vain, and reference to lower faculties misleading: Divine things belong to a realm of their own: Religious belief is experiential, indeed, but this is in the sense that there is 'experience' over and above all that is gained in commerce with the world and from reflection on ourselves: similarly it is natural in the sense that there is in our 'nature' a capacity for direct access to a supersensible world, in which we can see God." [1] "Mysticism claims to be able to know the unknowable without help from dialectics, and is persuaded

[1] *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 86.

that, by means of love and will, it reaches a point to which thought, unaided, cannot attain." [1] Récéjac, who is concerned lest Mysticism should remove Reason from its sovereignty, also lays down that "the synthesis of first principles as made in the mystic consciousness reaches only to a clearer and more intense realisation of our moral transcendence than is usual in our ordinary state, and this is the revelation of the Infinite dwelling in our Freedom." [2] Father Poulain writes: "The real point of difference (of the mystic union) from the recollection of ordinary prayer is this: that in the mystic state God is not satisfied merely to help us to think of Him and to *remind* us of His Presence: He gives us an experimental, intellectual knowledge of this presence. In a word, He makes us feel that we really enter into communication with Him." [3] "The highest and most divine things which it is given to us to see and to know," says the Pseudo-Dionysius, "are in some way the expression of all that which the sovereign nature of God includes, an expression which reveals to us that which escapes all thought and has its seat beyond the heights of heaven." [4]

It would be well, then, if the term *mysticism* could be rescued from the haziness of its ambiguity and restricted to denote the condition of the soul which has for its correlative the immediate act of God. This takes two forms. In the one the soul is merely passive and tries to empty itself actually of all self-content which could maintain the dis-

[1] Récéjac, *Bases of the Mystic Knowledge*, p. 7. [2] *Ibid.* p. 55.

[3] *The Graces of Interior Prayer*, 1910, p. 64.

[4] *De Mystica Theologia*, i. 3. Cf. Professor Pringle-Pattison's article on Mysticism in *Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., vol. xix. p. 123. Evelyn Underhill, *Mysticism*, 1911, does not do full justice to the divine activity over against man as the determining factor in the mystic union. See esp. Ch. IV.

tinction between God and itself. This is best exemplified by the attempt of Oriental mysticism in particular which seeks to get beyond life-in-form to formless life; to leave behind all that belongs to matter or to the separate self, and to rise on the wings of pure Spirit to a life beyond all experience. Plotinus achieved this state four times, we are told, and Dr. Buck has written a somewhat disappointing book on this topic in his *Cosmic Consciousness*.

This aiming at ecstasy is not favoured by Christian mystics in general. As Tauler says, "There be some even at the present time who take leave of types and symbols too soon before they have drawn out all the truth and instruction contained therein." [1] And in the *Theologia Germanica* itself, that ripest product of mediaeval mysticism, it is not the merging of the creature in the Creator which is sought for but the abolition of self-will, of "I, Mine, Me and the like," and the joyful proffer of self to God as an instrument of His will. The divine nature "without the creature would lie in His own Self as a substance or well-spring, but would not be manifested or wrought out into deeds. Now God will have it to be exercised and clothed in a form, for it is there only to be wrought out and exercised." [2] When then it says, "Be simply and wholly bereft of Self," [3] or quotes the proverb, "Going out were never so good, but staying at home were much better," [4] we must interpret it to mean the aiming not at the melting of self in God, but at the attainment of harmony with God, where self and God are not two or one but two in one.

[1] Quoted in *Theologia Germanica*, ch. xiii. [2] Ch. xxxi. [3] Ch. xxi.
[4] *Theologia Germanica*, ch. ix. Cf. *The Imitation of Christ*, Bk. I. ch. xx. § 2, "No man doth safely appear abroad but he who can abide at home."

"It hath been said: the more of Self and Me, the more of sin and wickedness. So likewise it hath been said: the more the Self, the I, the Me, the Mine, that is, self-seeking and selfishness abate in a man, the more doth God's I, that is, God Himself, increase in him." [1]

The second form of mysticism avoids the danger of a mere passivity in which form is reduced to a vanishing point, and holds that the mystic boon comes as a free gift from the Unseen to the soul which has practised the art of seeing the invisible in and with the visible. The main activities in fitting the soul for the mystic gift are desire, delight, and love, and apparently any object on which these faculties in their purity fasten is competent to secure the end. A wayside flower, the rustle of the wind in the tree-tops, the blue sky when nothing else is seen (as *e.g.* when lying on one's back on a hill-top), the sight of suffering, some magnetic personality, a course of keen intellectual strife, a deeply-felt injustice, human love and friendship, these and multitudes of other objects or events form the *praeparatio mystica.* Mysticism of this kind is but another name for the sacramentalism of the Christian Church which sees in every object more than appears, sees it as the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual principle, as suggesting more than it says, as a gateway out of form into life.[2] It is idle to enquire what the

[1] Ch. xvi.

[2] "Whatever may be the process by which plurality arises from unity, it would be contrary to the notion of unity if an accidental indefinite plurality should arise from it. On the contrary, from the first the variety of the elements will form a complete system, that grasped in its totality offers an expression of the whole nature of the One" (Lotze, *Microcosmus,*

machinery may be which brings about this purging of the inner eye, why the salient examples of its exercise are so few, while in germ it reposes in every mind; what we are concerned with is the matured product, the inner vision of the seer who, while retaining his self-identity, beholds the hidden unity of the world, or of some object in it, in which life and form, the Idea and its content are no longer two for Thought but one for Life.

Mysticism proper then belongs to the supernatural order, and emerges only in the phenomenal order when the Divinity in things reveals itself to the Divinity which is enshrined in the soul.[1] The mystic vision is a gift and comes as a surprise as on St. Paul's Damascus day, or when St. Augustine heard his "Tolle, lege"; it comes of faith, and that, not of ourselves, it is the gift of God.

One property of mysticism, moreover, calls for a word of notice, and that is its individual ground. The vision which constitutes mysticism comes to the individual, and makes him a μύστης, that is, one who has seen something which closes his mouth, whether he will or no, because what he has seen is so interwoven into the very fibre of his inmost being that it refuses to be detached and offered to others as material for mental assimilation. A constant

---

Eng. trans., 1885, vol. i. p. 446). And again (p. 556): "The essence of things could be described by thought proper, if the mental eye ever pierced to it through the veil of phenomena, though perhaps this description would contain many forms whose meaning cannot be conceived—only lived. But whatever this essence might be, it would involve the Idea as the formless permanent ground of changing forms."

[1] "Nihil enim fit visibiliter et sensibiliter quod non de interiore invisibili atque intelligibili aula summi Imperatoris aut jubeatur aut permittatur secundum ineffabilem justitiam praemiorum atque poenarum, gratiarum et retributionum in ista totius creaturae amplissima quadam immensaque republica" (St. Aug. *De Trinitate*, lib. iii. 9, Migne, vol. xlii. p. 873).

peculiarity of the divine vision, or message,[1] is its ordinary, sometimes even its trivial form, conjoined to a content which is crystal-clear, compelling, enriching and determining the whole of subsequent experience, and conferring an exaltation which lingers in memory as a fragrant perfume. In it the highest and lowest are made one ; God is incarnated afresh.

It would be a mistake, however, to regard this experience of the individual as purely individualistic, in the sense that its direct and necessary result is the formation of a spiritual atomism. It is true that the mystic is fond of saying, " My secret to myself " and " I only knew He named my Name," [2] but it is also true that the Power which reveals itself to him also reveals itself as the Power which is the hidden ground of the being of all other men. Indeed it would not be an exaggeration to say that only when the individual attains consciousness of his true relation to his own Ground does he attain any efficient sense of his solidarity with his fellows. And, as a matter of fact, all the great mystics from the two Catherines of Siena and Genoa to Oliver Cromwell and George Fox have been people whose lives were spent in the service of others. Further, it would not be difficult to maintain the thesis that all true socialism is builded, and can be builded alone, on a foundation of mysticism, and that any socialism which strives to build otherwise builds nothing but hay and stubble. So long as the mystic life ruled in the Apostolic Church communism

[1] Isaiah blends the two in ch. ii. 1. Cf. Zech. i. 9, הַמְּדַבֵּר בִּי ; lxx. ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἐμοί ; Vulg. " qui loquebatur in me."

[2] Cf. Browning, " Christmas-eve," vii. :

" Where I heard noise and you saw flame
Some one man knew God called his name."

was possible, and no longer. The Society of Friends has been distinguished equally by its devotion to the Inner Light, and by its practical benevolence. For mysticism is a higher third in which the dualism of ordinary experience finds at once its solution and its harmonisation.

It should now be clear in what sense it is said that mysticism holds the Key of all the Creeds, and of the Apostles' Creed in particular. Whatever its content may be, it is to be traced back to a mystic vision, a revelation of some sort, in some way, to an individual or individuals. That the chiefest of these individuals was Jesus Christ places no obstacle in the way of this statement, for the record affirms consistently that He referred all that He taught and all the authority he exercised to His "Father in Heaven," *i.e.* to the Being that philosophy regards as the hidden ground of existence. That He felt Himself impelled to be in His Father's house,[1] that at His baptism He saw in vision the heaven opened and heard a heavenly voice,[2] that a voice spake to Him out of heaven,[3] that He saw an angel in Gethsemane[4] are isolated examples of the abiding hiddenness of His life in God; they are like emergent rocks on a wide plain revealing the nature of the soil beneath.

Moreover His disciples lived by the visions vouchsafed to them. The three saw their Master and Moses and Elijah in glory;[5] the shepherds had a vision of angels;[6] Zacharias and Mary saw Gabriel;[7] Stephen saw the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God;[8] Saul heard the voice

[1] Luke ii. 49. [2] Luke iii. 21. [3] John xii. 28.
[4] Luke xxii. 43. [5] Luke ix. 31. [6] Luke ii. 9.
[7] Luke i. 11, 26. [8] Acts vii. 56.

of the ascended Jesus,[1] and Paul was caught up into the third heaven;[2] Peter beheld in a trance the heaven opened;[3] and John the theologian was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.[4]

These repeated records of supernormal states of consciousness forbid us to rest content with any rationalistic conception of Christianity, or to yield to the temptation to suppose that the theology of our religion is ever more than diagrammatic, that a Creed is more than an imperfect formulation of the life. If we were called upon for an affirmation where all is but guess-work, we should say that what came to the disciples sporadically was the abiding possession of their Master. If the angels of His little ones do always behold the face of the Father in Heaven,[5] this perpetual vision was surely also His, and if so His phenomenal life, while conforming to that of the ordinary man, masked a consciousness to be apprehended by those alone to whom in some degree a similar vision has been given. To the poet "the meanest flower that blows can give thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears," while to the clown "a primrose by the river's brim a yellow primrose is to him, and it is nothing more."

In maintaining, however, that the Christian life is specifically to be found in a higher consciousness, we must guard ourselves against being supposed to suggest that this higher or mystic consciousness is incompatible with the consciousness of ordinary life, or that it brings with it a feeling of the unreality of common things. On the contrary, the mystic alone is competent to understand the world we all live in, for he alone sees its *meaning* and is

[1] Acts ix. 4. [2] 2 Cor. xii. 2. [3] Acts x. 11.
[4] Rev. i. 10. [5] Matt. xviii. 11.

able to detect the glory that encompasses every object dealt with by sentience. With Mr. Balfour he can "consider the case of bonnets" and see their law;[1] with Lotze he can detect the principle which imposes on us top-hats and high heels;[2] with Carlyle he can enter into the philosophy of clothes; with Walt Whitman he will call nothing common or unclean; and with Jesus Himself he will regard no man as a fool, because from Him he will have learned that all men are brethren, whatever their station or capacity, and that all things in earth as in heaven declare the glory of God.

From this principle that life in all its degrees of activity is to be recognised in its manifestations around us, there follows conversely the truth that life is constantly taking form through every degree of density of the world of matter. Of this latter truth a particular case is to be seen in the irresistible tendency of the mystic life to enform itself in creed and cult, *i.e.* in theology and organised worship. Every vision, every mystic experience, unless it is to remain sterile must find some means by which its energy can be brought to bear on others; in other words, it must take form. But the form it takes can never yield its full content to those who use it, or study it, until they have attained the same mystic experience of which the symbolic form is the expression. This is what is meant when we say that mysticism is the Key of the Apostles' Creed. At the back of this Creed and of every creed, at the back of every utterance in the Bible, at the back of all philosophies, and of all religious practices there reposes a revelation given at first-hand to him

[1] *Foundations of Belief*, 1895, p. 50.
[2] *Microcosmus*, ed. 1885, vol. i. p. 592.

who in the last analysis is responsible for the creed or parable or philosophy or ceremony.[1]

Hence, though the Apostles' Creed come to us in the form of statements of historic fact, or philosophic doctrine, no interpretation of it can ever be more than superficial which limits itself to an enquiry into the evidence for that historic fact, or into the rational proof of the doctrine, or to an enquiry into the methods by which the various articles were thrown together. The confession, however, has to be made that current works on the Creed do as a matter of fact so limit themselves, and that their failure as interpretations, therefore, is hardly to be excused on account of the critical acuteness and industry and wealth of knowledge which they display as a rule on every page. Man does not live by science alone. He wants, before all things, *life.*

[1] Rohde suggests that the doctrine of immortality in Greece goes back to the " enthusiasm " which was produced in the worshippers of Dionysus by their frenzied dances and by the cries and chants and wild instrumental music which accompanied the dances. This ecstatic state was felt to be more than human, and, therefore, god-like. Hence it exalted its subject to the life of the gods, *i.e.* to deathlessness (*Psyche*, 1894, pp. 296 ff.).

CHAPTER IV

MYSTICISM AND THE CREED

In the previous chapters we have discussed the problem of the interpretation of the Creed as a particular case of the problem of the reconciliation of authority and individual freedom ; [1] the question as to whether Christianity was first mystical then Catholic, or in some sense both at once,[2] and the nature of mysticism.[3] There now remains (before proceeding to a consideration of the articles in detail) the necessity of showing (*a*) what precisely is meant by the assertion that these articles bear in general the stamp of mysticism, and (*b*) how their mystical content is to be harmonised practically with their historical or philosophic form.

(*a*) Mysticism has been defined above (p. 34) to be a complex of the supernatural as the active factor and of the reaction to it of the soul as the passive, by which everything is excluded from the definition which does not bear the character of the supernatural, or (if the term "supernatural" be objected to) of the Divine. If we ask now what is likely to be the effect on the percipient soul of the immediate touch of God, we must answer that there will be aroused a predominant and permanent interest in the inner side of things, that is, in the

[1] Chapter I. [2] Chapter II. [3] Chapter III.

soul (or spirit) which informs and animates the world round us, and especially man himself. It follows as a corollary from this that interest in the external side of things will be proportionately diminished, at all events for a time; that is to say that the expression of religion, for example, in creeds and institutions and cults will be deemed of inferior importance to the life which the soul itself has become conscious of, independently it may be of these forms. The articles of a creed, the facts of Church history, the rubrics of the institution, or the beauties of ceremonial worship will either be despised and left on one side, or used as stimuli only to that better thing which the soul has already found within. They will either be dismissed at once, or at best tolerated as questionably useful members of an order which is at every moment ready to vanish away. No doubt a time will come later when the division between the vision and the form will be seen to be illegitimate, when the soul of the Idea and its form will be regarded as an indivisible whole, but this will not alter the fact that the mystic will always be supremely interested, and probably with growing passion, in the unseen Forces which are masked by that which appears.

Such a person will, when the Creed is put in his hands, ask himself at once what it has to say, if anything, about the inner facts of his experience, and, if he be a member of a Church which offers it to him, he will be predisposed to believe that it must have something to say. He will not, therefore, apply to it primarily his reason but his intuition, and only when he has convinced himself that the Creed is incompatible with his intuitive knowledge,

or contradictory of it, or out of all relation to it, will he throw it on one side as useless and without interest to him.

If, however, he finds that it can be made to give expression to what he knows already of the spiritual order, he will honour it and use it, but he will also insist on interpreting it in terms of his own soul's experience. Nor will he allow himself to be thrust from his inherent right to interpret for himself [1] a document which is his by virtue of his membership in a community which has constructed or taken it over for its own purposes. Just so did the Christian martyrs of the Empire die for their right to worship what God they pleased, resisting to death all attempts to turn them from mystics into the puppets of authority. "Here I stand; I can no further" is the invincible challenge thrown out by Freedom against despotism, and by its courageous maintenance only is this sad world made better.

Now let us apply these truths to the Creed as a whole. It wears, it is true, a philosophical or historical form, but our concern here is not with either form but with the Life which has revealed itself to the mystic. That Life has told him only *that* it is, but not *what* it is. He provisionally assumes, therefore, that his Church would not invite him to state his experience in terms of its Creed unless it had good reason for believing that the Creed would not only be found to agree with what he knew, but would also help him to give his knowledge more precision, and to draw from it much that had hitherto been implicit only.

[1] "We may talk about the right of private judgment, or the duty of private judgment, but a more important thing to insist on is the *necessity* of private judgment" (Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, 1888, p. 47).

He will not find any difficulty in its Trinitarian form, if only for the reason that as a student of the soul he is already familiar with the Trinitarian division into thought, feeling, and will, or if he be a student of St. Augustine into the lover, the loved and the love which mediates, or into Existence, Knowledge, and Will.[1] If he be familiar with the facts of comparative religion he will remember that India has its Trinity of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva, the Creator, Preserver, and Destroyer, and that every Egyptian temple had its divine triad. The fact that the first Christians, or, if you like it better, the first reflecting Christians were induced to throw their mystic experiences into a Trinitarian form will cause no difficulties, but will, on the contrary, carry with it a presumption that a doctrine so widely spread owed its prevalence to its agreement with Reality.[2] But, on the other hand, the doctrine of the Trinity, being a doctrine and not a fact of

[1] Otherwise, *Memoria, intelligentia, voluntas* (*de Trin.* x. 11, 12). "Dictum est 'tres personae' non ut illud diceretur sed ne taceretur" (*De Trin.* v. 9). Earlier and more concrete images were found in the division into source, river, current; root, branch, fruit; sun, heat, and light. Cf. also: "Dico autem haec tria: Esse, Nosse, Velle—sum enim et scio et volo: sum sciens et volens et scio esse me et velle et volo esse et scire, in his igitur tribus quam sit inseparabilis vita et una vita et una mens et una essentia, quam denique inseparabilis distinctio et tamen distinctio, videat qui potest. Certe coram se est; adtendat in se et videat et dicat mihi, sed cum invenerit in his aliquid et dixerit, non jam se putet invenisse illud quod supra ista est incommutabile, quod est incommutabiliter et scit incommutabiliter et vult incommutabiliter" (*Conf.* xiii. 11).

[2] If the number *three* has its home in the heavens it has its counterpart on the earth, and when John Scotus Erigena says that "the three Persons of the Trinity are less modes of the Divine Substance than modes under which our mind conceives the Divine Substance," he is only tracking the effect to its cause. So Juliana of Norwich says that "our soul is made trinity-like to the unmade blissful Trinity known and loved from without beginning, and in the making oned to the Maker" (*Revelations of Divine Love*, ch. lv.); and St. Thomas says, "A likeness of the Divine Trinity is observable in the human mind" (*Summa contra Gentiles*, iv. 26).

mystic experience,[1] cannot escape from the necessity laid on all products of inferential Reason of being criticised, and, if necessary, modified and brought into line with fuller knowledge, if such there be.[2] If the mystic attain to fuller knowledge, and knowledge that carries with it the inner stamp of certainty, he will not, however, be in a hurry to thrust it forward, but will feel that as his Church has had to exercise great patience with him, so he is in honour bound to be patient in his turn with her. But how he shall act, and when, must be determined for him in all cases by the Inner Light which is his.

When our mystic comes to face the more historical portion of the Creed, viz. that which tells the life-story of Jesus Christ, he will, if he be true to himself, see there not so much the story of a particular life as of a universal and, therefore, a typical life. And the details that are given of this typical life he will immediately and necessarily construe as forming his own ideal life-story, without troubling himself unduly about the historical side

[1] "Observe the word *self-evident*, for there lies the truth of the matter; for you have no more of the truth of religion than what is self-evident in you. . . . You can know nothing of God, of Nature, of Heaven, of Hell, or yourself, but so far as all these things are self-evident in you" (William Law, *The Way to Divine Knowledge*, 1752, p. 185, quoted by Caldecott, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 281). But direct intuitive apprehension can only tell us *that* God is; it is left to reflective thought to say *what* He is.

[2] But the doctrine having been first established by reflection on the facts of Christian experience by means of current philosophy, it became necessary, if the doctrine was again to become religious, for it to be translated back into mysticism. "Das Mysterium der immanenten Trinität" (as expounded *e.g.* by St. Augustine) "ladet zur Pflege einer mystischen, kontemplativen Frömmigkeit ein. Namentlich aber gilt es fernerhin als unerlässlich, dass man erst einen Blick in dieses ewige Geheimnis getan hat, ehe man an die gläubige Aneignung der Offenbarung herantritt. Was im Rückgang des Denkens von der Offenbarung auf ihren Grund eine letzte Folgerung war, wird nun zum Prius für das Verständnis der Offenbarung selbst" (O. Kirn in *Realency. f. prot. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1908, Band 20, p. 116).

of them. He will not be concerned to affirm, neither will he be concerned to deny the historical accuracy of the stories of the Virgin birth, of the Crucifixion, Resurrection, or Ascension, for in so far as these emerge on the plane of history they submit themselves to the ordinary laws of historical criticism, and fall under the jurisdiction of the critical expert.

He, however, as a man of religion, approaches them as religious, that is, inner events, and sees, for example, why the Creed contains no reference to the baptism of the Christ, viz. because what was contained in that was already sufficiently set out by the article of the Virgin-birth. The Crucifixion as a mere historical event would be of no more note than the myriad of crucifixions with which the cruelty of man has studded history, for to the mystic the Crucifixion recorded in the Creed is in its essence the inner crucifixion to which the Captain of our salvation submitted Himself, and to which each of His followers must also submit. Similarly the Resurrection to the mystic is no mere re-animation of a physical body from which life had before fled, but it is the resurrection of the soul out of the lower region of human living into the higher region where the human becomes the superhuman. The Ascension, too, in its turn is to him not so much a physical happening—though he is not called on to deny this—as the last act in the long drama of the birth, pilgrimage, and home-coming of the soul, which out of many tribulations has its life now hid with Christ in God.

But something more must be said, if the mystic element in the Creed is to receive due justice. On the supposition that in Chapter II. there has been

given a well-founded account of the essentially mystical character of Christianity in its origin, then there follows necessarily the inference that the truths of the Creed were true before they took shape in history.[1] Virgin-birth, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension are not only moments in the life of one Individual, but are moments in His because they have a cosmic significance, and in some degree have been always part of the world-order. Something of their power surely was known by Enoch who walked with God, the just and perfect Noah, Abraham, the friend of God, and Moses who saw God, by Elijah in his mystic chariot of fire, by Socrates who followed his δαίμων to death, by Plato when he fell in love with eternal beauty, by Gautama who prepared the intellectual ground for Christianity, by Spinoza, the "God-intoxicated" Jew, by the great company who out of all peoples, nations, and tongues, and out of all religions have endured as seeing Him who is invisible.

Are we then, it will be objected, to understand that the historical life of Jesus of Nazareth is a myth, that the Gospel-story is nothing but fragments of forgotten and misunderstood mystic truths of secret sects which a grosser age has set in the lower key of history, that Jesus either had no historical existence, or that if He had His life-value differs from that of any pious teacher or guide in degree rather than in kind? By no means. Here comes in the consideration already insisted on in Chapter I. (p. 9) that process and event are not mutually exclusive but complementary. The cosmic process requires

[1] With this may be compared the truth that stealing is forbidden by the Eighth Commandment because it is wrong, and is not wrong because it is forbidden there.

not merely repeated and more or less imperfect formulations of its life and meaning, but also strives for a full and perfect manifestation of that life and meaning which may recapitulate all that is good and true in the many imperfect forms it takes. The Christian maintains that such a perfect actualisation has taken place in the person of Jesus Christ.

Further, if he is asked how he accounts for the facts of the historical life of Jesus being such as to fit in easily into the framework of the moments in the pilgrimage of the soul set out in the mystic scheme, he will ask how it could be otherwise. If there are fixed laws which the soul has to obey on its long pilgrimage, they are the same for all souls, and no arbitrary harmonising of the gospel-story with the soul-story of mankind is necessary or even permissible, for the simple reason that as He was so are we in this world, and *vice versa*. Nor would this position be shaken if criticism succeeded in discrediting the evidence for the historical Virgin-birth, or if Jewish polemic proved that Jesus met His death by stoning (for which there is no evidence). In that case all that would be necessary would be to modify the article of the Virgin-birth, but by no means to reject it, and to explain that from the point of view of religion a violent death of any sort would satisfy the mystic's requirement. And this because a death inflicted by man, and especially by authority, would itself be a testimony to the world's hatred of those who follow their own star instead of its torch.

(*b*) We have already indicated the theory by which the mystical and the historical in the Creed are to be reconciled, by the truth, that is, of the ubiquitous law which binds life to form. But

something more than theory is necessary before we can hope to gain acceptance or even tolerance for the claim that the mystical is constitutive of the historical. How, it may be asked, as things are, is any member of a Church to-day in which the Creed is imposed on him by authority to gain freedom to interpret for himself? Must he not sooner or later come into conflict with authority, or at all events bear the intolerable burden of a never-ceasing gnawing uneasiness of conscience, due to the suspicion that he is not loyal *ex animo* to his fellows?

Before answering this question we must interpolate the caution that the Creed and its interpretation belong to humanity and not only to those Churches which have adopted it, and that, therefore, our appeal is to all who care for religion. What is more, the mystical interpretation should find a no less sympathetic welcome at the hands of the large and increasing body of good people who stand aloof from all forms of organised religion, and of the large number of those within the Churches who are crying out for something better than the dry husks they get. To them both the mystical truth offers relief, and opens out a promise that they need no longer be severally self-excommunicated or isolated, but may take their place side by side with those who worship God after the manner of their fathers. Is it not worth while, it may be fairly urged, for these latter to do something to regain those they have lost or those they retain with difficulty? Should they not remember that all other attempts have failed, and that they have failed because they made their appeal to forms, about which we all differ, and have a right to differ, instead of to

life, which alone can solve our *anomia* and compose our differences ? It may be affirmed emphatically that no reunion of Christendom, in whole or in part, is possible, or even desirable except by a frank and faithful and courageous acceptance of the supreme authority of the mystic life.

But, however this may be, it does not solve the difficulty put in the question above as to the way in which members of organised Churches may reconcile their right as free beings with their position as subjects of authority. Nor would it be any sufficient answer (at least for them) to point out that the religion which is mystic, *in and for itself*, is not a proper subject for organisation at all, and indeed never has been organised, and never can be organised. In Browning's well-known words : [1]

> . . . my spirit's wonder
> Thou art able to quicken and sublimate,
> With this sky of thine, that I now walk under,
> And glory in thee for, as I gaze
> Thus, thus ! Oh, let men keep their ways
> Of seeking thee in a narrow shrine—
> Be this my way ! And this is mine !

These lines carry the true mystic ring of independence, certainty, and aloofness. But it is not the whole truth. Another comes to keep it company in the lines from the same poem : [2]

> Needs must there be one way, one chief
> Best way of worship : let me strive
> To find it, and, when found, contrive
> My fellows also take their share !
> . . . . . .
> For I a man with man am linked
> And not a brute with brutes.

[1] " Christmas-eve," v., *sub finem*.
[2] R. Browning, " Christmas-eve," 20.

The gregarious instinct must supplement the individualistic. But observe what is implied in the full mystic gospel. The basal half of it is the individual's first-hand knowledge and certainty (no matter how arrived at), and the complementary half of it is his duty to help others to share his own gift. He therefore becomes a missionary with a propaganda, as did Jesus Christ; an apostle, as did St. Paul; the founder of a community, as did St. Benedict and St. Ignatius Loyola and St. Francis of Assisi; and while the founder with his mysticism is able to inspire his fellows with his own life all is well. But as soon as the age of the *Epigonoi* sets in, when lower motives rule, and the brotherhood becomes an institution, then the difficulties of all who retain the founder's spirit begin. Nor will they end before the rulers of the institution abnegate, or leave quiescent, the secular power by which they rule, and go back to the objects and spirit of their Chief.

To put this truth quite plainly, let us say that in so far as the officers of any Church which bears the name of Christ rely on any sort of coercive authority to compel obedience they are abjuring for the time being their Master, and are acting as State officers purely and simply.[1] The mystic, therefore, who finds himself a member of the community they rule suffers a violent injustice when he is called on to put his soul in their hands, and has a right to call on them to admonish him as a brother, on the ground of their joint share in the mystic life, instead of seeking to compel him as a subject.

[1] "There is a story that some Tory Churchman said to the late Professor Thorold Rogers, 'Religion must be compulsory, or else there will be no religion at all.' 'I cannot see the difference,' was the answer" (D. G. Ritchie, *Principles of State Interference*, p. 148).

Nobody can have his cake and also eat it, and a Christian Church cannot be at once Christian and secular. As Christian it is mystic, and can compel no man; as secular it is itself a subject of the State, but to confuse the two is to give to Caesar the things that are God's. The mystic, therefore, should set his mind at rest, for it is not he that is in the wrong in sticking loyally to the truth that God has given him; it is his ecclesiastical rulers (*i.e.* secular rulers appointed for public offices of religion) whose consciences should be uneasy when they and he come into conflict. He may be said to represent Christianity as it was in the beginning, they the Christianity as it became after it was secularised.

But a further difficulty may be raised. The mystic may say that he does not desire to be left in the cold outside the established Churches, and that, therefore, while remaining inside he feels himself bound to observe honestly the obligations attaching to inside membership. He finds himself, however, in the unfortunate position of not being able to accept what the main body of his fellows hold, what their formularies seem to say, and what their rulers lay down as the law. Well, in this case, the reply is that he should first assure himself in the presence of his God that he is not actuated by any vanity, restlessness, self-sufficiency, impatience, or love of singularity, then obey wherever he can, and as far as ever he can, and where he disagrees express himself modestly, and in every case make no attempt to conceal what he holds to be true.[1]

[1] Harnack gave similar advice in 1892 to a number of students who asked his advice on the advisability of an agitation for the removal of the so-called "Apostolikum" from the legal formulae of the evangelical Church. See *Reden und Aufsätze*, i. p. 221 ff.

If he does this he has done his part honestly, and if he is wrong it is for the community to take action, not he. It is a species of impertinence for a man to judge his Church, by voluntarily quitting it, whether for Rome or Agnosticism. Let the Church judge.[1]

Let us note finally what it is that we are invited to accept as Christianity. The religion by which Jesus Christ lived, *i.e.* belief in the Fatherhood of God and in the Brotherhood of Man, as evidenced by the documents of history, says Dr. Harnack;[2] the Catholic religion as a going concern, says Abbé Loisy; the sacramental system as founded by Christ, and shown to be valid by the undying corporation of the Episcopate, says the high Anglican, all agreeing in one point, viz. that Christianity is something external to the Christian and remaining external. Justification by faith is what saves, says the Lutheran; the vicarious Sacrifice and its appropriation, says the revivalist. All tell the truth, but it is a truth out of focus. It is not in history, nor in learning, nor in intellect ("non dialectica placuit Deo salvum facere populum suum," says St. Ambrose) that our salvation lies, but in the age-long presence and power of God, the lover of the souls of men, Who never ceases to exercise His attracting and uplifting activities on the spirit He made for Himself.

If it be said that the stoutest champions of Christianity as a historical religion have never been

[1] "Ohne Autorität kann der Mensch nicht existieren, und doch bringt sie ebensoviel Irrtum als Wahrheit mit sich; sie verewigt im Einzelnen, was einzeln vorübergehen sollte, lehnt ab und lässt vorübergehen, was festgehalten werden sollte, und ist hauptsächlich Ursache, dass die Menschheit nicht vom Flecke kommt."

[2] *Das Wesen des Christentums*, 1900.

so foolish as to maintain that saving power is to be found in history alone, but rather in history as the bearer of a Divine activity in the background, then all that need be said is that this is an admission of what mysticism contends for. The mystic adds, however, that the history in Palestine is virtual only, not effective, until it is translated into terms of inner experience in the individual.[1]

[1] Cf. Scheffler's beautiful lines on the "Mystic Catholic":

"Lo! in the silent night a child to God is born,
And all is brought again that ere was lost or torn;
Could but thy soul, O man, become a silent night,
God would once more be born in thee, and set all things right.

"Ye know God but as Lord, hence Lord His name with ye;
I feel Him but as Love, hence Love His name with me!
How far from here to heaven? Not very far, my friend;
A single hearty step will all thy journey end.

"Though Christ a thousand times in Bethlehem be born,
If He's not born in thee, thy soul is all forlorn;
The Cross on Golgotha will never save thy soul;
The Cross in thine own heart alone can make thee whole."

CHAPTER V

THE FIRST ARTICLE

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth

Πιστεύω εἰς Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς.

After having discussed in the previous chapters (*a*) the dualism in which Mysticism plays its part, (*b*) the nature of Christianity as witnessed to by its earliest documents, (*c*) the nature of Mysticism, and (*d*) the mystic character of the Creed as a whole, we are now in a position to deal with its twelve articles in detail with the view of finding out, firstly, whether they severally bore a mystic sense from the first, and, secondly, what in any case is the meaning which the mystic will put upon them to-day. Without anticipating the result of enquiry, it may be hinted beforehand that we shall find in all probability that what may be called the primary articles were from the first such as put their mystic meaning to the front, and that the secondary are at least patient of a mystical interpretation. Further, it will most likely become clear to the unprejudiced reader that whatever the meaning

of the articles at the bar of history, the Creed to-day must either be interpreted mystically or be abandoned.

It is not without significance that the Creed is put into the mouth of the individual, that it opens with the word *I-believe* and not *We-believe*, for it makes the road easier to the interpretation of the mystic, although it does not banish other pilgrims from the road. For suppose that the man who says the Creed is just one of those elementary souls who paint the world in black and white, he will proclaim that no honest man can get away from the fact that a thing either is, or is not, that Jesus Christ, for example, either was crucified on the 15th of Nisan, A.D. 29, at nine o'clock in the morning on a hill just outside Jerusalem, or He was not, and that so there is an end of the matter. The mystic has no desire to deprive this simple soul of his carbonarian faith, but he will beg leave to point out that no term is more ambiguous than the personal pronoun *I*, unless it be the most majestic of all terms, *God*.

For the content of each is determined by the place in evolution occupied by the speaker. When a Pascal or a Goethe says *I*, he is referring to a symbol which conceals a hidden treasure indefinitely greater than that covered by the term in the mouth of a hairy Ainu, so that at the very opening of the Creed a large number of roads diverge marked each by its own finger-post. Along one may be seen walking slowly and with downcast eyes the pale student of history or philosophy; down another marches one who looks like a policeman intent on seeing that no unauthorised person passes that way; here again is a soldier with his Creed inscribed in

black-letter on the scabbard of his sword; an antiquary pursues his way with a precious parchment on which the Creed is illumined; on a high road, well metalled and hedged, ambles on his palfrey an ecclesiastic with a good word for everybody; and presently down a blood-stained, craggy road, filled with nets and gins, a lawyer threads his way with a volume of Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law* under each arm, which tells him that his Creed is in a schedule to an Act of Parliament. There is, however, one pilgrim who may be found on all roads (the pedant's perhaps excepted), who quarrels with no fellow-traveller, and, when asked, "symbolises" with all because, as he avers, he holds something which includes the truth of all. His *I-believe* subsumes that of all the rest, not so much because he has nothing to learn from them, but because his mystic experience has given him an angle-point from which he can sympathise with all.

It is precisely in this opening up of sympathetic understanding that one principal factor of the mystic's experience is to be found. It is not so much that he is set by it free from any previously-acquired bad habits, or that he acquires greater capacity in art or science than he possessed before, as that he now is set in living relation with the Centre, and so knows how to appraise and love every living thing that he sees at the circumference. For he sees with each the radius connecting the object on the circumference with the Living Being at the centre. How then should not his *I-believe* include that of all others, seeing that he brings theirs into his, fused with his, as the colours of the prism are fused into one in the white? The man of

science, the man of orthodoxy, the missionary, the lover of the past, the responsible bishop, even the lawyer, are not to him rivals, but colleagues, each guarding what is committed to him, but, as he thinks, men who would be wiser and happier if they could but see the living heart of what they carry, the Reality in the Creed which alone gives it meaning and value.

I-believe in.

The overwhelming majority of Christian theologians have maintained that the spiritual activity defined as "belief-in," or rather "believing-into," [1] belongs to the Will as truly as to the Intellect.[2] Hence "I believe in" is equivalent to "I choose to believe in," or "I decide to believe in," which at once suggests the question what it is that impels the choice or decision, what train of Thought, what wave of Feeling, or, to go a step further back still, what was the efficient cause of the Thought or Feeling. For unless the Will is set going by Thought or Feeling (should we not rather say by Thought *and* Feeling?) it remains blind, and unless Thought

[1] Πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν Θεόν rather than πιστεύειν Θεῷ.

[2] *E.g.* St. Augustine: "Quid est ergo *credere in eum*? Credendo amare, credendo diligere, credendo in eum ire, et ejus membris incorporari" (*In Joh. Evang. tract.* 29, § 6, Bened. ed., pt: ii., vol. iii. p. 515. Again: "Dicis 'credo.' Fac quod dicis et fides est" (*Sermo de temp.* p. 237, in Bened. ed., v. 271). And again: "Ille credit in Christum qui et sperat in Christum et diligit Christum" (*Sermo 144 in verbis Ev. Johan.*, Bened. ed., v. 693). Similarly St. Thomas concludes that the act of faith which is expressed by the phrase "I believe in God" is an act of the understanding moved by the will, for "voluntas movet intellectum et alias vires animae in finem" (*Summa*, ii. ii. 2). In the preceding article also he insists that even "credere est cum assensu cogitare," and adds that this belief imports an activity of the intellect joined to some amount of enquiry and consent of the will.

or Feeling be stimulated by some cause external to themselves they remain dormant. St. Paul, followed by Christian thought in general, says that the cause is the grace of God, co-operating (as one important modern school of psychology adds) with the interested attention of the man himself. There still remains the difficult question as to how the interest which compels attention is itself produced. How do I come to be interested in philosophy rather than in gardening, in hunting instead of in politics, in the country more than in the town? It is little use to say with Dr. Caldecott [1] that "modern psychology comes to our aid: the difficulty is fictitious after all, at least in part," for the part where it is not fictitious is just the part that causes the difficulty. What is to make me allow "certain aspects of experience to enter into the focus of my interest"? Before I can pay attention to a thing I must take a living interest in it. Whence springs this interest? for obviously it is not and it cannot be manufactured to order.

The only rational answer is that our present interest in a thing, our desire for it and love of it have been won by past experience, whether in this life or in previous lives, and that experience is always the necessary result of the stimulation of our inner self by our environment. But each object in our environment is a particular which is also a phase of the Universal, for "in it as it is abides the Infinite, whose abundant nature unites the attributes, ready with its force to protect them, or to carry out their alteration." [2] The essential power

[1] *Philosophy of Religion*, 1901, p. 73.

[2] Lotze, *ut supra*, i. 384. "For inherent truth and consistency will compel the Infinite, with every special finite form which it assumes, to fix

of the Infinite latent in every individual acts according to fixed laws, one of which is the law compelling all living finite things to push on towards the Infinite. Hence if I do not yet believe-in God, it is only because the stage at which I am does not yet allow of it; but if, on the other hand, I am given, for instance, a friend who insists that I shall pay attention to God, my interest in my friend is likely to lead to my taking an interest in time in God. For God in His world is a purposive force, who waits but gets His way in the end, and the end is man's salvation.

From this it seems to follow that not everybody can say, "I believe-in God," but only the man who has advanced so far along the Pilgrim's Way as to recognise in some effective form his relation to God. The further he has advanced the more thoroughgoing is the act of "belief," but in every case where the confession is real and sincere some first-hand experience is involved, even if it still slumbers in the mysterious depths of the subconscious mind.

But now what is this believing-in God which we are so ready to assent to? The question is one of the most important that we can be called upon to answer, and when we have found the answer we shall find that none save a mystic is able either to give it or to repeat his Creed in its fullest meaning.

The phrase πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν Θεόν is characteristic of the Fourth Gospel,[1] though not confined to

also the unalterable mode of action to be executed in it, in accordance with the ideal that presided over the creative moulding of this particular form as an essential part of its manifestation" (*ibid.*). Cf. also pp. 643, 649, 651.

[1] It occurs in Matt. xviii. 6, Mark ix. 42, Acts x. 43, xiv. 23, xix. 4, Rom. iv. 5, x. 14, Gal. ii. 16, Phil. i. 29, 1 Peter i. 21, 1 John v. 10, but

it, and there it is a deliberate substitution for the phrase which occurs frequently in Acts *βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*.[1] In the latter the formal side of entrance on the Christian life is emphasised, in the former the vital side; the fulness of the act requires both. In both, however, there is contained the connotation of passing from one state of existence into another. To put a thing down to the account of another, such as a sum of money or a slave would be expressed by *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, and the same phrase was used when a human being crossed over from the peculium of the devil to be the peculium of Christ. "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils," said St. Paul,[2] and similarly he would say that baptism into the name of Christ transferred a man from the power of the name of the devil.[3]

The phrase of the Creed and of the Fourth Gospel is similar except that here it is the subjective side of the transaction which is emphasised, and this of set purpose. To believe-away-from the old master and to believe-to God is to turn "from darkness to

not elsewhere in N.T. except in the Fourth Gospel where it is found over thirty times. In the N.T. otherwise we have "believe" absolutely, or with the dative, or with *ἐν* with the dative, or with *ἐπί* with acc. or dative.

[1] "Βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα giebt einen (den) Zweck und einen (den) Erfolg des Taufens an: es besagt, dass der Taufling in das Verhältnis der Zugehörigkeit, des Eigentums zu Jesus tritt" (Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 1903, p. 127).

[2] 1 Cor. x. 21.

[3] "Vor dem Siegel Christi entweichen die überwundenen Dämonen und Mächte; wo er und sein Geist weilen, haben sie keine Stätte. Dass auch diese Seite des Namenglaubens für Paulus wirksam gewesen sein *kann*, (um nicht zu viel zu sagen) wird deshalb wahrscheinlich, weil er nach Col. i. 13 die Wirkung der Taufe sich auch als Errettung aus der Macht der Finsternis verstellte" (Heitmüller, *ubi supra*, p. 328). Cf. also the striking phrase in Clem. Al. (*Strom.* ii. 8. 36) *εἰς γὰρ ὄνομα Ἀνθρώπου πλασθεὶς Ἀδὰμ φόβον παρέσχεν προόντος Ἀνθρώπου, ὡς δὴ αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ καθεστῶτος.*

light," [1] where it is evident that the word "believe" is insufficient. For if "belief" as used in the Creed were nothing but "assent to that which is credible as credible," were confined to the intellect, the proposition which implies motion (or the analogue of motion) from something to something else would be out of place. But what takes place in this act of "believing-to" is a transference of the whole personality, and is, therefore, best stated as belonging to the Will, if only it be understood that in the Will is included also Thought and Feeling. We should go further. In the act of conversion [2] the whole phenomenal personality seems to suffer a spiritual violence at the hands of an inner and higher Force which drives it into the Kingdom of Heaven with joy, and then it as the old Ego made new can say with a fulness it could never use before: "I have transferred my trust from Self to God; I have come to confide in Him; my times are in His hands; I no longer serve Sin, that is Self,[3] but I am a member now of the Divine family. I belong to God and I reckon myself as credited to His account." May we not then ask whether so tremendous a confession as this, involving a complete *volte-face*, a snapping asunder of the dearest and most intimate and most prolonged inner relationships, can be effected by any power but that of God in His direct unveiling of Himself to the soul? In other words can any but the mystic say confidently and with

[1] Acts xxvi. 18.

[2] Ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε, Matt. xviii. 2.

[3] "Adam, the I, the Self, Self-Will, Sin, or the Old Man, the turning aside or departing from God, do all mean one and the same thing" (*Theologia Ger.* ch. xxxvi. "Our human affections, without which in this mortal state we cannot live, are as the feet wherein we are affected by human affairs" (St. Augustine, *Hom.* lvi. on St. John xiii. 10).

intuitive knowledge: "I, my whole being, am now as a river which is running irresistibly towards God?" [1]

[1] Blass points out (*Grammar of N.T. Greek*, pp. 122-3) that in the N.T. εἰς to some extent absorbs ἐν and answers the question: "where?" as well as "whither?" But he also points that Matthew is free from this usage, and that the Epp. and Apoc. "show at least in the local signification a correct discrimination between εἰς and ἐν," and concludes that this use of εἰς was still a provincialism. He also favours the varied use of εἰς or ἐν after πιστεύειν, ἐλπίζειν, εὐδοκεῖν, and in connection with ὄνομα as due to the comprehensive sweep of the Hebrew preposition. But a theological purpose has been at work here in the N.T. as well as a philological tendency.

CHAPTER VI

THE FIRST ARTICLE (*continued*)

God, the Father, Almighty

Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα

It is not a question which concerns us specially whether the first article of the Creed was based on the baptismal formula of "God, Jesus Christ, and Holy Spirit," or on the triune formula of Matt. xxviii. 19, "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit," a question which raises the further question as to whether the elementary form of our article was: "I believe in the Father," or "I believe in God."[1] For in

[1] Both McGiffert (*The Apostles' Creed*, 1902, pp. 178-186), and Zahn (*The Apostles' Creed*, trans. by Burn, 1899, pp. 54-61) agree that the original form was "I believe in one God, the Almighty," and that Father was a later insertion due, according to McGiffert, to the influence of the Johannine type of thought, and to Zahn as a protest against third-century Monarchians. They point out that Θεὸς παντοκράτωρ is a better attested phrase than Πατὴρ παντοκράτωρ, but McGiffert does not account for the insertion of πατέρα if, as he says, it meant the "father of the world," for "God Almighty" already implies this, nor Zahn for the omission of ἕνα, if it were original. Though, moreover, it is true that the first baptismal formula ran in the name of Jesus, the triune formula which supplanted it can hardly be brought down so late as to be wholly posterior to baptism in the name of God, Jesus Christ, and Holy Spirit. Sufficient weight does not seem to have been given to the fact that the analogy of history makes it probable that from the first two tendencies were at work in the Church, a mystical and a theological; that the former would strike its roots deeper but be less known, the latter be more vocal; and that the mystical school would certainly be more drawn to the formula, "Father, Son, and Spirit," and the theological to the formula, "One God, Almighty."

either case the mystic interpretation, though it may take a different road, will come to the same goal.

We need not delay with any foolish attempt to explain what we mean by "God," for, as St. Augustine says of Time, we all know what we mean by it until we are asked to give an account of it. The Power that is at once supreme, self-existing, infinite, spiritual, perfect, immanent, and transcendent,[1] is what most theists mean by God. In the Creed it is a datum about which not much is said, and what is said is partly mystical, partly an after-thought of theologians.

The mystical element proper to the Creed from the beginning is expressed in the term *Father*. The term is no new term, but is more common in ethnic religions than in Jewish; indeed, it hardly occurs at all in the O.T. as an epithet of God,[2] and all attempts to show that Jesus owed His doctrine to Jewish doctors is doomed to failure when we observe that what was distinctive in it is not O.T. teaching at all. Not only is the Fatherhood of God practically absent from the O.T., but the title "Son of Man," in spite of Daniel, cannot be rooted there; nor has the baptism, whether of John or the Church, any precise analogue in the O.T.; the ceremonial baptisms insisted on by the Pharisees, and the ablutions of the Temple officers, offer no explanation; the doctrine of regeneration has no place in Judaism; the affirmation that in God we

[1] Caldecott, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 1.

[2] The only passages which can be quoted are: Ps. lxviii. 5, lxxxix. 26, Isa. ix. 6, lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8, Jer. xxxi. 9, Mal. i. 6, ii. 10, 2 Esd. i. 29, Wisd. xiv. 3, Ecclus. xxiii. 1, 4, li. 10, and of these the last four only are relevant, and yet are far from the N.T. signification.

live and move and have our being [1] is better suited to Athens than to Jerusalem; the statement that God and man are of one substance [2] is one that the Jew would regard certainly as meriting death by stoning. Yet this identity is what Jesus affirmed, what the Jew denied, and what the O.T. leaves unsupported. Whence, then, came it to be the central truth in the religion of Jesus Christ? We can best answer this question when we have first enquired whether it occurs in any other religion besides His.

In Homer and Hesiod Zeus is frequently described as Father of gods and men.[3] Sophocles styles him Olympian Zeus, father of all.[4] Euripides makes Medea say to Jason that she could say many things in reply to him, if it were not that Father Zeus knew his sufferings and doings.[5] The Hymn of Cleanthes, line 34, beseeches Zeus as Father to turn the darkness of error away from the souls of men, where the whole context shows that the Fatherhood is one of nature and creation as well as of governance. Epictetus could say: "Slave yourself, will you not bear with your own brother, who has Zeus for his progenitor, and is like a son from the same seeds, and of the same descent from above? Will you not remember that they are the offspring of Zeus?" [6] Aristotle, however, thinks that in the relation of father and children there is a form of

[1] Acts xvii. 28. The passages quoted in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, ii. 216 ff., by Dr. J. S. Candlish are not apposite, as he says expressly that the sonship spoken of there is not attributed on the ground of nature or creation, but on that of redemption and grace. But it is the former ground that we are concerned with here. See on the other hand Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 1902, p. 188.

[2] John x. 30.

[3] Πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶντε.

[4] *Ph.* 275, ὁ τῶν ἁπάντων Ζεὺς πατὴρ Ὀλύμπιος.

[5] *Medea* line 1349, εἰ μὴ Ζεὺς πατὴρ ἠπίστατο.

[6] i. 13.

kingship, and that for that reason Homer introduces Zeus as Father.[1] In the *Poimandres* it is said that All-Father Mind, being Life and Light, did bring forth Man co-equal to Himself, where, however, "Man" is the Heavenly Man in the realm above. Zeller sums up the theology of the Stoics in saying that their whole view of the world is founded "upon the theory of one Divine Being—begetting from Himself and containing in Himself all finite creatures."[2] Seneca says that Hermes, Dionysus, and Hercules were names of Zeus.[3] A prayer to Ptah of the time of Rameses III. addresses him: "Hail to thee! Thou art great; thou art old, O Tatenen, Father of the gods, etc."[4] In the so-called *Mithrasliturgie*, edited by Dieterich, the candidate is assured by the hierophant that the way of the visible gods shall be seen through the disk of the sun, his father, god.[5] Commenting on the Ὑε Κύε of Eleusis, Proclus says that in the sacred rites the worshippers looked up to heaven and called out ὑιέ, and looking down to the earth cried κύιε, knowing that the birth of all things is from these two as father and mother.[6] The Propator of the Gnostics is familiar.

[1] *Eth. Nicom.* viii. 10. 4.

[2] *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, p. 322.

[3] *Benef.* iv. 8. 1, "Hunc (Jovem) et Liberum patrem et Herculem et Mercurium nostri putant. Liberum patrem quia omnium parens sit." Cf. Servius *ad Georgica* i. 5 in Arnim, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, xi. 313, "Stoici dicunt non esse nisi unum deum et unam eandemque potestatem, quae pro ratione officiorum variis nominibus appellatur. Unde eundem Solem, eundem Apollinem, eundem Liberum vocant." So Diogenes Laert. vii. 135, ἕν τε εἶναι θεὸν καὶ νοῦν καὶ εἱμαρμένην καὶ Δία.

[4] *Harris Papyr.* i. 44. 3 ff., in Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 1904, p. 61.

[5] P. 6, l. 12, ἡ δὲ πορεία τῶν ὁρωμένων θεῶν διὰ τοῦ δίσκου, πατρός μου, Θεοῦ φανήσεται.

[6] In Plato, *Tim.* p. 293 C, διὰ τούτων ὡς πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς τὴν γένεσιν εἶναι πάντες γινώσκοντες.

There is no need to labour the point further. The thought of God being in literal fact the father of men and of all things dominated the Hellenistic religion at the beginning of our era. But it was a thought that was alien to the monotheistic creed of Judaism as it meets us in the O.T. God to the Jews was King and Lord by virtue of His being our Creator; He might become Father in the sense of governor or benefactor, and this is the sense in which the relation is thought of in the literary Prophets after the Exile. On Hellenistic ground, however, the thought of God as Father of men, *i.e.* as in some sense their author and producer was at home. And it was to Stoic Pantheism that St. Paul turned for his authorities when he sought to convince the Athenians.[1]

Since then the doctrine that we also are God's offspring was widely current when Jesus lived on earth, we need not scruple to say that so far as its form went He derived it from ethnic sources. This, however, is only half the truth. The outside world does not act on any one of us in such a way as to produce actively a certain resulting product from us passively, but to every change in our inner or outer state we ourselves contribute something through our inner life. So was it with Jesus; with the difference, however, that His response to the outside stimulus was obviously more energetic and more autonomous than that of others. Hence when the Greek world suggested to Him the Fatherhood

[1] Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν is from Aratus, *Phaenom.* 5; cf. the Hymn of Cleanthes, ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γενόμεσθα, θεοῦ μίμημα λαχόντες μοῦνοι ("we alone are born from thee, we alone who have been given likeness to God"). The full text is in Stobaeus, *Ecl.* i. 1, in von Arnim i. 121, and in James Adam, *Vitality of Platonism*, p. 104, who gives the text as emended by Meineke, and points out, p. 134, that the μίμημα θεοῦ consists in our νοῦς.

of God the suggestion was forthwith transmuted into something richer by the force of His own fulness of life. The proof of this may be seen in the following considerations:—

1. God is called *Father* by the N.T. writers primarily and specifically as the Father of their Lord Jesus Christ, whose sonship was defined or established by the power God had put forth in Him to raise dead souls to life through a spirit of holiness,[1] even as He Himself had been raised from out of the midst of dead souls,[2] and so endowed with power over them that believed. Hence salutations run from God, "the Father of us and of the Lord Jesus Christ."[3] Hence Paul's customary description of himself is "an Apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God," where God is the ultimate authority, Jesus the proximate. This same order is found in Ephes. i. 5, where the adoption into the heavenly family is attributed to Jesus Christ as the agent. As the door for others the Apocalypse styles Him "the first-begotten of dead souls,"[4] and in 1 Cor. xv. 21, He is referred to as the man through whom comes resurrection of dead souls. That the raising of souls from spiritual death, and not any resurrection of the body is meant in these passages is still more clear in Rom. vi. 4, where the raising of Christ from out of the dead stands as a parallel to the disciples walking in newness of life; both, therefore, must belong to the same genus, and that genus is defined in the context as the death of sin or the life of grace. In all these passages one leading idea prevails: the singular endowment of holiness in

[1] Rom. i. 4. [2] Gal. i. 1, Ephes. i. 20.

[3] Rom. i. 7, 1 Cor. i. 3, 2 Cor. i. 2, Ephes. i. 2, Phil. i. 2; in Gal. i. 4 the marginal reading of R.V. is the same. [4] Rev. i. 5.

Jesus Christ was the condition for God bestowing on Him both power over the world which lies in sin, and, in consequence of that, power to raise others as well. His human sonship consisted of an actual impartation by God of His own divine and superhuman life, so that in a special sense God was Father of the Man Christ Jesus.

2. According to the Synoptists, the disciples of Jesus were to put before them as their ideal their Father in the heavens, and become perfect like Him ; [1] they were to pray to Him ; [2] they were to expect His Spirit to speak through them ; [3] but it was the same Spirit which rested on Him ; [4] He, too, prayed to the same Father ; [5] He differentiated between God and Himself ; [6] and stated their distinctness and intimacy,[7] an intimacy not unlike that of the disciples' angels.[8] These passages, so far as they go, say nothing of any consubstantial and eternal indwelling in the divine Pleroma, but take up the truth of the Fatherhood of God, and tell us that Jesus, out of the depth of His own intuitive knowledge and sense of oneness with His Father, raised the ethnic doctrine to a vital act or habit which enabled Him as man to transcend ordinary human knowledge of God as far as ordinary man's does that of his faithful dog. Nor should we overlook in this connection the fact that all the Gospels make His baptism of critical importance to His religious life, and so enable us to understand why some authorities read the Voice as saying :

[1] Matt. v. 45.
[2] Mat. vi. 9.
[3] Matt. x. 20.
[4] Matt. xii. 18.
[5] Matt. xxvi. 42.
[6] Luke xviii. 19.
[7] Matt. xi. 27.
[8] Matt. xviii. 10.

"Thou art My beloved Son; this day have I begotten Thee." [1]

3. The fourth Gospel elaborates the thesis that the truth of the Fatherhood of God was raised by Jesus to a height of meaning never before attained. It never itself speaks of Jesus as the Christ, or the Messiah, but leaves this to others,[2] and uses itself the mystic title "Son of Man." It gives out as its text the announcement that in Jesus the Logos had come down to earth, and, therefore, gives us to understand that the aim of the whole Gospel is to show the heavenly Truth and Life which have appeared on earth. Perhaps, if we are to do critical justice to the Fourth Evangelist, we ought to say, however, that he does not restrict the self-manifestation of the Logos to His appearance in the historical Jesus, but strives to show how Jesus represents typically, even if supremely, the enlightening work of the Logos in every man that cometh into the world.

[1] Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Trypho*, 88) says: "There came a voice which was uttered also by David when he spoke, personating Christ, what the Father would say to Him: 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee,' (the Father too) saying that His generation would take place for men at the time when they would become acquainted with Him: 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee.'" In the Gospel of the Ebionites, called the *Gospel of Matthew*, Epiphanius says there was contained the statement that "there came a voice from heaven saying, 'Thou art my beloved Son'; and again, 'I have this day begotten Thee,' and immediately there shone round about the place a great light," *Agt. Haer.*, ch. xxx. Clement Al. *Paedag.* i. 6. 25, says: "Immediately on the Lord being baptized there sounded from the heavens a voice witnessing to the Beloved: 'Thou art my beloved Son, I this day have begotten Thee.'" St. Augustine (*De Consensu Evang.* ii. 31) says that it is said that the words "this day I have begotten Thee" do not occur in some older Greek MSS., from which it is clear that he was acquainted with MSS. which did contain the phrase. In the *Enchiridion ad Laurentium*, ch. xlix., Augustine again quotes the text in the form "Ego hodie genui te" (Bened. ed. vi. 215).

[2] Andrew in i. 41, the Samaritan woman in iv. 25, the multitude in vii. 31, 41, 42.

Moreover, the relation of the Son to the Father in this Gospel is not different from that in the Synoptists, even though the accent be on a different place. Jesus has His heavenly food in order that He may do the will of His Father;[1] His life of activity is moulded on that of the Father;[2] He is so intimately united to His Father through love that like Him He heals the impotent,[3] quickens dead souls,[4] judges as the Father's surrogate,[5] and is the recipient of the Father's life.[6] He was sent by the Father in order that He should give life to all whom the Father drew to Him,[7] and it required a special revelation to recognize in Him the Father.[8]

There is no need to quote all the passages in this Gospel which refer to God as the Father of Jesus Christ. It is enough to say that they consistently affirm three things—the superearthly nature of Jesus, His subordination to His Father by way of economy, and His sense of vital oneness with Him. Further, He does not exclude others from His own exaltation. Through Him His disciples become entitled to be called, and to be sons of the heavenly Man, or sons of God; His Father is their Father, for they, too, are διδακτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ; the authority given to Him He in His turn gives to them.[9]

The above rapid survey seems to compel us to say that in the main the N.T. does not invite us to the fruitless and impossible task of striving to comprehend God, but puts before us the form of Him whose name we bear as Man, and bids us observe how as man He yet shows Himself at least

[1] iv. 34. [2] v. 17. [3] v. 19.
[4] v. 21. [5] v. 22. [6] v. 26.
[7] vi. 44. [8] vi. 46. [9] xx. 21.

super-man because of His mystic life, whereby He and the Father are one in thought, feeling, and will. But if one in this vital fashion, must there not lie behind this mystic oneness a yet deeper oneness of being, of substance? A reply is hinted at in Phil. ii. 5-11, but the theme is one rather for wonder and worship than for theology or controversy.

So far, however, as we are concerned—for the mystic proceeds by the way of the Will rather than of demonstrative Thought—the confession of the Fatherhood of God implies that of our substantial sonship, not a sonship of adoption merely, or of metaphor, or of any other fictitious analogy by which men have sought, after the fashion of Uzzah,[1] to save the honour of God at the cost of the intelligibility of His world, but a sonship of nature which is none the less real because it is of grace.[2] Where this truth is watered down, or made to square with a one-sided Transcendentalism, there is produced a view of life which is at bottom pessimistic, in place of that optimism which is the natural and necessary result of a living grasp of the audacious assertion that we are God's offspring. As Manilius says:

> Quis coelum possit nisi coeli munere nosse,
> Et reperire Deum nisi qui pars ipse Deorum est?

Belief in God, a knowledge of God, is only possible to a being who already has some kinship of nature with God. This is the truth which alone gives Anselm's famous argument from the idea of God to His existence its validity. Man being potentially divine, God having taken form in His

[1] 2 Sam. vi. 6.

[2] Cf. St. Augustine, *De symbolo*, Bened. ed. vi. 547, "Incipitis eum habere patrem quando nati fueritis per Ecclesiam matrem."

world that He might raise it to the height of His purpose for it,[1] the idea of God as a being than which a greater cannot be conceived becomes at once that necessary thought which the argument requires.

Moreover, this truth develops inevitably into the further truth that the descent of God into the world carries with it the descent of man, and that since God descended that He might also ascend,[2] so man is destined to ascend to where he was before.[3] In other words the mystic's creed is an optimistic creed, a creed of faith in a present and inescapable God, of hope of a sure possession some day (for have we not already its ground in ourselves ?) and of love which sees the hidden good in all.

Let us then conclude, that when the Creed bids us say that we believe in God the Father we mean, and are meant to mean by the phrase, that God is at the root of our being, that in a mystic sense we are consubstantial with Him, that it is His life which flows in our veins and functions in our souls, that we have come down from heaven and not crawled up out of the slime, and that our souls which came forth from God are on their way back to God their home.[4]

[1] Ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, ἵνα τὸν ἄνθρωπον δεκτικὸν θεότητος ποιησῇ, St. Athanasius, *C. Ar.* ii. 59. Cf. Iren. iii. 19, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ Λόγος ἄνθρωπος [ἐγένετο] ἵνα ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὸν Λόγον χωρήσας, καὶ τὴν υἱοθεσίαν λαβὼν υἱὸς γένηται Θεοῦ ; and v. Preface, "Jesus Christus factus est quod sumus nos uti nos perficeret esse quod ut ipse."

[2] Ephes. iv. 10.

[3] A striking illustration of this conception is supplied by the well-known "Hymn of the Soul," edited by Dr. Bevan in *Texts and Studies*, vol. v. No. 3.

[4] Harnack, in an interesting passage gives three senses in which God was called Father in the Early Church. But he omits the one given above which alone unifies his three and is their presupposition : "God is named the Father, (1) in relation to the Son (very frequent); (2) as Father of the world (the Father and Creator of the whole world (1 Clem. xix. 2)—the Demiurge and Father of the aeons (*ibid.* xxxv. 3); (3) as the merciful One who has proved His goodness, declared His will, and called Christians to be His sons, 'the all-merciful and beneficent Father' (1 Clem. xxiii. 1);

Almighty

Παντοκράτορα

This word is characteristic in the N.T. of the Apocalypse where it occurs eight times,[1] for in the only other N.T. passage where it occurs it is part of a quotation from the O.T.[2] It is of frequent occurrence in the LXX, where it represents אֵל שַׁדַּי 48 times (31 of which are in Job), also frequently in the Apocrypha, and in the apostolic fathers, with whom it is ordinarily joined to God.[3] Hence

---

'let us approach Him then . . . loving our kind and affectionate Father' (*ibid.* xxix. 1); 'for He bestowed on us the light when the Father addressed us as sons and saved us from perishing (2 Clem. i. 4); 'so, brethren, doing the will of the Father and keeping the flesh pure and guarding the commandments of the Lord, we shall receive aeonian life' (*ibid.* viii. 4; cf. x. 1); 'so, brethren, doing the will of God our Father we shall be of the primal, spiritual Church that was created before the sun and moon; . . . let our portion be of the Church of life that we may be saved' (*ibid.* xiv. 1). The identity of the Almighty God of creation with the merciful God of redemption is the tacit presupposition of all declarations about God in the case of both the cultured and the uncultured" (*History of Dogma*, Eng. trans., i. 180).

[1] i. 8, iv. 8, xi. 17, xv. 3, xvi. 7, 14, xix. 15, xxi. 22.

[2] 2 Cor. vi. 18.

[3] *E.g.* 1 Clem. i. 2: "Full of holy counsel, in good zeal, with pious trust ye stretch out your hands to the all-governing God" (*πρὸς τὸν παντοκράτορα Θεόν*). It is applied to Hermes; cf. *Anth. P.* App. 282. Montanus audaciously said: *ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ καταγινόμενος ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ.* So Clement Al. (*Stromata*, iv. 7. 58), *ἓν μὲν τὸ ἀγέννητον ὁ παντοκράτωρ.* And *Mart. Polycarp*, xiv., *Κύριέ ὁ Θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, xiv. 1; and xix., *δοξάζει τὸν Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα παντοκράτορα.* Polycarp, *Ep. ad Philippenses* salutes them: *εἰρήνη παρὰ Θεοῦ παντοκράτορος.* Hermes, *Vis.* iii. 5, *τεθεμελίωται δὲ ὁ πύργος τῷ ῥήματι τοῦ παντοκράτορος καὶ ἐνδόξου ὀνόματος.* Irenaeus has the full phrase *εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα* in i. 10. 1, as part of an elaborate creed. The *Θεὸς παντοκράτωρ* occurs again in i. 22. 1; iii. 11. 1; iv. 33. 7.

On the other hand, *κοσμοκράτωρ* (which occurs in the N.T. in Ephes. vi. 12 in the phrase "rulers of this darkness") is used of the *ἄρχοντες τοῦ κόσμου.* But these rulers are the planetary gods whose rule in general is that of *εἱμαρμένη*, or Fate; they are called sometimes the *στοιχεῖα.* The claim of the Christian gnostic was that above the world of the seven

it is better in our Creed to read "God" as the object of belief, and to treat "Father," "Almighty," and "Maker," as three epexegetical terms defining the conception of God.

The word παντοκράτωρ, however, does not mean *Almighty*, but all-*governor*, and is to be regarded as a strengthened form of a word which occurs frequently in Gnostic writings, κοσμοκράτωρ, or world-governor. But as κόσμος is ambiguous, denoting sometimes Nature simply, sometimes this same Nature as disobedient, and sometimes Nature as an ordered whole opposed to chaos, so in order to avoid any misunderstanding παντοκράτορα is substituted for κοσμοκράτορα in order to make the all embracing sweep of God's government more explicit.

It is difficult, however, to say what *Almighty*[1] can mean as applied to God. It sounds as if it meant that the will of God were not bounded by any Reason, that it had, as the writer of the Epistle to the Ephesians would say, no counsel.[2] But if there were no sure reason, or βουλή, all things would be

planets (the Hebdomad) was the world of Freedom (the Ogdoad, or heavenly Jerusalem), and that Jesus was the Gate or Door which opened out of the world of Necessity into the world of Freedom. Hence the "Father of Jesus Christ" is παντοκράτωρ, in the sense that He is Lord of all the κοσμοκράτορες, or rulers of the lower world. Cf. *Excerpt. ex Theodoto*, 80, "Who is born of (earthly) mother is brought into death and into the world; who is born again through Christ is transferred into life and into the Ogdoad."

[1] As equivalent to omnipotent. In a "Missa in Symboli traditione," printed by Neale and Forbes, *Ancient Liturgies of the Gallican Church*, 1855, p. 173, the priest, after reciting the Creed instructs the catechumens: "Symbolum istud, dilectissimi, non atramento depingitur, sed humanis cordibus insertum memoria retinetur." Then immediately after he interprets "omnipotentem" thus: "Omnipotentem vero ideo dixit, quia omnia potest: cuique nihil impossibile est: quia coelum, terram, mare, homines adque omnia animalia, non aliquo operis actu aut artificio, sed solo creavit imperio."

[2] Κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ is his phrase, ch. i. 11.

possible to Him, as they came into His mind, as we should say. It would have been possible to make a better world than this ; it would have been possible to make self-determining beings who could not choose evil, to blot yesterday out of Time, to make things to be and not to be in the same sense, to call good evil, to make the possible a mere matter of arbitrary choice, in short to make impossibility possible. All things would be possible because all is irrational.

The matter becomes clearer perhaps, if we distinguish between what is possible *simpliciter*, and what is possible *ex suppositione*. What is possible under the former head it is impossible for us to say. But given some perception of what is good and rational in our minds we can say what is incompatible with goodness or reason. That men should turn sometimes into asses, or that the Law of Causality should sometimes rule and sometimes be inoperative, would be neither good nor rational.[1] " All admit that God is omnipotent, but to define the nature of the omnipotence seems difficult. . . . But a little consideration will show that when we say that God can do all things, we mean rightly that He can do whatever is possible. If we say that we mean by " possible " what is possible to God's power this is a mere circulatory proposition affirming that God can do what He can do. We must say absolutely, therefore, that God can do all that is possible. But what is possible or impossible depends on the meaning of the terms we use." There is a logical possibility or impossibility, as when we say that Socrates sits down, or that a man is an ass, and a real possibility or impossibility,

[1] Cf. St. Thomas Aq. *Summa*, 3*a*, qu. 46, art. 2.

as when we say that fire burns, or we see a noise. And St. Thomas concludes: "ea vero quae contradictionem implicant sub divina omnipotentia non continentur quia non possunt habere possibilium rationem." [1] This conclusion, though it limits God's omnipotence to whatever does not involve a contradiction, gives no help in discovering the metaphysical ground of this impossibility. If the Absolute suffers no rational contradiction can He suffer no moral contradiction? If not, what other reason can be given but that the Will of God is self-determined by His Substance. There seems point in Mr. Bradley's demurrer: "I shall be told that the Governor of the Universe is *omnipotent*. Perhaps; but as I never could find out what that means, I can hardly be expected to admit it as true." [2]

That God is the governor of the universe is a conclusion of philosophy; that He governs me, and orders all that concerns me is a mystical truth. Such a truth comes to the soul, not by the roundabout road of demonstration or along the thousand by-ways of experience, but in the same way that the Law of Identity and the Law of Causation are recognised as necessary laws of Thought. That is to say, "It is the actual experiences themselves which stimulate the mind gradually to unfold its nature, and in its encounter with things to learn those modes of action which it finds necessary." [3] So the mystic's knowledge that the full sovereignty of God, extensively and intensively, is a necessary truth of his spiritual life, comes through the lamp of experience throwing its bright beams on the dormant seeds of truth concealed in the soul. But the know-

[1] *Summa*, 1 qu. 25. 3. [2] *Mind*, O. S. viii. 259.
[3] Lotze, *ubi supra*, i. 671.

ledge once acquired is acquired once for all, though indeed much may have to be done and suffered before its full content is revealed through unswerving obedience.

There are two main fields in which our mystic sees that the sovereignty of God is exercised, in his environment (including his heredity), and in the inner field of his spiritual life. Both call for a word of explanation.

Every man finds himself at birth in a world which he is soon taught by priest and scientist to regard as an ordered whole. Yet he cannot but be disconcerted frequently, when he comes to years of discretion, by the observation that disorder still seems to spoil the symmetry of the whole. Nature lives by the ceaseless struggle of one species against another, and of each individual against other individuals. A storm destroys in an hour the growth of six silent months; an earthquake lays a whole district in ruins; a pestilence sweeps off bird and beast; tropical heat is fatal to many forms of life, and arctic to others; and in temperate zones weather will be as sporadically destructive as climate is constantly destructive elsewhere. In human life, too, since man is under the law of mechanical necessity, all these maleficent forces smite blindly, and others are added. Moral evil, which at best slumbers or dreams in the brute, is awake and active in man. So that if the world be a *cosmos* it is at all events streaked with chaos, and Persian dualism becomes intelligible, even if it prove ultimately inadequate.

Moreover, human society, which may be regarded as God's way of marshalling men, is no less imperfect than the Nature in the midst of which it is a garden

enclosed. The present age is eloquent of its sense of inequalities, injustices, crudities, and cruelties exercised by man on man, and is all the more indignant because it sees at once that it has established itself all these evils, and is apparently powerless to get rid of its Frankenstein's monster. Meanwhile, even apart from social wrongs on the large scale, the individual often finds himself the impotent victim of some turn of Fortune's wheel; or he is born into a family or a social environment, or a caste against which every fibre in his being revolts; or he is conscious as he grows older that by some mysterious force he is driven further and further away from his earlier ideals, and yet imprisoned by custom and habit in modes of life which he detests.

Nor is this all. A still more insidious and wholly unavoidable evil accompanies him in his going out and in his coming in, bearing the name of Heredity. It is true that he is promised some relief under this head by the apostles of Eugenics, but he reflects that the relief will come in his heirs, and therefore too late for him, and, what is worse, that in any case hereditary taints are, and have been for untold ages, a property of the very world of which God, he is assured, is the All-Governor. Why should an immortal soul, conscious of its celestial origin, be doomed to contend with a weak constitution cursed with a tendency to disease, with an unstable nervous system, or an inadequate machinery for the purposes of mental activity, and all through the ignorance or self-indulgence of ancestors whom he did not choose for himself? Ought—he dares to apply the term to God—ought God to visit the sins of the fathers upon the children? And if He does, as

apparently He does, can we say that He is an ideal All-Governor ?

Now it might be replied that such impatient questionings are quite proper to youth, but are gradually silenced with the years that bring the philosophic mind ; that experience teaches us to admit that we do not know the plan of the whole ; to recognise that we are incompetent to say either how the world came, or why it is what it is ; and that we are compelled a thousand times a day to acquiesce in what we are powerless to explain. These considerations are admirable aids towards resignation, but they cannot pretend to produce that rarer temper which is proper to mysticism. They can help us to suspend our judgment and to hold our tongue, and to endure with fortitude the ills we cannot cure, but they cannot bring us into living union with the All-Governor, in which alone is peace and understanding.

Secondly, man is not merely a subject of the outer world of Necessity, but is also a citizen of the inner world of Freedom. There is his true home, and this kingdom of Heaven within does *not* lie open so that every fool may rush in. It suffers violence, and must be laboured and fought for. It is no arbitrary command but the eternal Law which says : " Ask, seek, knock," if you would enter into life. God Who made us without our will will not remake us against our will. But surely it may be replied, at all events, so soon as our will is for life, He will at once grant the boon we seek and Himself remove all obstacles. The ignorance which blinds the soul's eye, and the weakness which paralyses its arm will, of course, be done away by the light of His truth, and the power of His love. That this

is not so, is the sad confession of all souls and of all mystics. What God does is to give some token of His presence for good to His struggling child, no great thing it may be, but some message he understands, some encouragement in his troubled moments enough to make him know and see that God is on his side, and that if He does not do more it is not because He will not, but because, the world being constituted by Him as it is, He cannot. On that vision the Pilgrim then lives and presses forward and fights, even though it be not repeated or supplemented through weary years. The heavens, he remembers in his darkest days, did once open for him, and he saw their glory, and heard the voice which spoke to him things he cannot repeat to others, for the reason that what was said was not in words of human language, but, like a truth dimly seen in a dream, or the fabled secret revealed at Eleusis, it was addressed to that part of him—or rather to that whole of him—of which thought is but one function and language one expression.

Nor is it to be thought, in saying this, that this mystic vision is in any essential respect different from the intuition by which we judge of values, or that the sense of God's presence is peculiar to a chosen few. For the opposite is what is true in each case. It is no doubt true that it is by a process of reasoning that we arrive at our moral criterion, and through critical analysis that we assert it to be goodness, or pleasure, or both. But it is not reasoning which informs us what is good, or what pleasure or happiness is like. The pain of a toothache, the pleasure of a good dinner, the bliss which comes from awe, or the " shame of self at thought of seeing Him," are all immediate data of experience, not in

themselves mediated by anything else. Similarly, it is an intuitive judgment which asserts that love is better than egoism, loyalty than falsehood, courage than cowardice, kindness than cruelty. Nor even if anybody chooses to say that the intuitive judgment of this sort is the ripe product of many single experiences and only seems intuitive because habit has made it instantaneous, does this affect the question. For, however reached, the judgment is now intuitive, and unquestionable for the subject which makes it.

That when the Good is thus intuitively seen it is right for us, or a duty laid on us to choose it, and set the Will upon it is a general proposition in ethics which is necessarily true for the very existence of an ethical system at all. For this means that the duty of choosing the Good when recognised is a duty which has universal objective validity. And this is only another way of saying that the Being of God seems to be that alone which is the sufficient ground of the "categorical imperative" of Duty, by which we are bidden to do what is right for its own sake though the heavens fall, to uphold right as right in scorn of consequences.

This conclusion of ethics is of special importance at the present time. For those who read the signs of the times tell us almost unanimously that almost every nation of the civilised world shows ugly signs of degeneration. And this not only in the industrial sphere. What most of all causes disquiet is the absence of any general sense of Duty, any sub-conscious presupposition of all action that what matters infinitely more than anything else in a man's inner life is the habit which issues in his doing what he ought.

We see the lack of this stern insistence on obedience to conscience in the lowered standard of political morality, in the indifference with which this lowness of standard is treated, in the tameness with which non-party iniquities are put up with, in the easy contentment of "those who have" with the *status quo*, and in the impartial failure of all existing Churches to discriminate in their practice and in their strivings between that which is and that which is not essential. There is needed an Elijah to remind us that no Church and no State can halt between two opinions without courting disaster; that God is the All-Governor, and that what He reveals as possessing objective ethical validity reduces to comparative insignificance all intellectual statements about religion, all historical settings of religion, and all institutions no matter how venerable or efficient they may be.

The reasons for this decay of moral sensitiveness are probably complex, but they certainly include three which may be easily recognised. In the first place, comfort, luxury, and material well-being in general have never been a favourable soil for the growth either of Spartan simplicity or Stoic sternness. It is as true as ever that the rich man can hardly find the door of the kingdom of heaven, or even want to find it. But this is not the worst of the evil. That he gets into the way of imagining to himself that the moral law is toned down for him, and that it presses less inexorably on him with his £100 a week than on his gardener at £1 a week, is a form of self-deception which will suffer as rude an awakening as no doubt the Grand Monarch experienced in spite of his boast that God would think twice before damning a man of his consequence.

In the second place, writers, like Emerson, who blur the distinction between God and man in their desire to emphasise the immanence of God in His world; systems of thought such as America has shown herself able to produce in such teeming abundance — Theosophy, New Thought, Higher Thought, Christian Science, and others—are all, with no doubt the best intentions, co-operating to throw our thought and practice into confusion, by making God a function of man's thought instead of the All-Governor to whom each of us must give account of his doings.

In the third place we may fairly ascribe some portion of our present ethical anarchy to the hedonistic philosophy which for two centuries has ruled English moral philosophy. For if, on the one side, as Green pointed out, hedonism has taught politics to count each man as one and one only, on the other it has depreciated our judgment of value, and inculcated a view of life which makes the ordinary man disregard all other sides of the moral ideal except that which is concerned with the calculation of consequences in terms of pleasure. And this, in the long run, seems likely to be fatal to all robustness of ethical belief.

It is obvious that if sufficient time be allowed, the habit of mind which sees Evil to be but Good in the making, and hence views with bland indifference Good and Evil alike, will inevitably be fatal to any crisp sense of personal responsibility or strenuousness of moral endeavour. If all comes from God then our wisdom will consist not in hating the evil that is in Evil, but in detecting the good which it contains, for that is the signature of its Divinity. And this can only end in moral anarchy

and in heroic pessimism—two evils which seem to be threatening the very foundations of the Christian civilisation of to-day.

The way out is the old way of a practical return to the old ways. God still sitteth above the water-floods. He is the All-Governor, and any nation, or Church, or individual which ignores Him, or thinks to usurp His authority must end by being broken against the Rock of Ages.

Maker of Heaven and Earth

ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς

McGiffert is probably right in saying that this clause "adds nothing to the sense of the original article, and really makes its meaning no more explicit," [1] yet language is not merely an instrument of thought, but in its higher forms it is also a transmitter of feeling. Hence it may be said that the addition of this clause, by making explicit what before was implicit only, has the effect of enhancing our feeling of the majesty of the Father, which may be all the more necessary because of the intimacy which the title of Father suggests to the believer.

But a further truth is stated in these words—one, indeed, which we have already touched on. St. Cyril of Jerusalem adds, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων, in which he is followed by the Constantinopolitan Creed with its clause, "and of all things visible and invisible." We must take this as not affirmative of an extra fact, but explanatory of "heaven and earth"—heaven is the name for things invisible and earth for things visible. The

[1] *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 110; cf. Zahn, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 111.

antithesis is the familiar antithesis of Life and Form, Spirit, and Matter, and the assertion that both are the product of the one God bars out, and is intended to bar out, any belief in two Principles such as was taught by Zoroastrianism, and afterwards by its disciple, Mani, as well as, to all intents and purposes, by the popular form of belief in the devil which has lain for centuries heavy on the heart of Christendom.

The word *made* is the word used by the LXX for the Hebrew word rendered *created* in Gen. i. But what precisely do we mean by creation or creator? For to say that it means making the world out of nothing is to use a phrase without any one necessary meaning. It may mean that the process by which the world became is beyond our understanding altogether, which is a truism. Or it may mean to deny that God called the world into existence out of matter which was lying from eternity ready to His hand, but external to His own substance. Or again it may mean that God did not produce the world out of His own substance as the spider does her web. Or once more it may be meant by the word *creation* to deny that the world is (like God Himself) from everlasting. Or we may intend only to affirm a belief that God belongs to the eternal order, the world to the temporal, and that the two are related as cause and effect, or at any rate as ground and consequence. In this last case we are illegitimately applying a category under Time—that of Causality, to a moment out of Time —that of Creation. But if we take the wider category—that of ground—then we mean rightly enough that God and the world are as the end and the means. "The distinction between means and end lies not in the fact that the former precede the

latter, but in the fact that the former is valued for the sake of the latter."[1] This, then, is but one way of saying that the world is dependent on God, but without implying so far that God is dependent on the world in the sense that if it could cease to be He would cease to be also.

It is this latter position to which pantheism seems to commit us, and is denied by the term *maker*. "For pantheism God is the immanent ground of the world, for deism He is the transcendent ground, for theism He is both."[2] The difficulties for thought in this statement are insuperable. If God be immanent in His world, and that is all there is to be said, then He and His world stand or fall together, which is impossible. If He merely transcends His world how is it possible to think of it as apart from Him, or how can we think at all of an act which found God and His world at one moment in relation and ever afterwards out of relation? If both are true at once, as theism says, do the two by turns rule, each abdicating while the other acts, or are both there all the time, and if so how can that be transcendent which is at the same time immanent? And it would seem, therefore, that the problem is beyond us, but that the theist's position is nearer to reality than either of the others.

But if Creation be inconceivable as being before

[1] Rashdall, *Theory of Good and Evil*, ii. 229.

[2] James Ward, *The Realm of Ends*, p. 234; Dr. Ward himself solves the difficulty by pointing out (after Kant) the part that our perception and our understanding play in constructing the world of our knowledge, which, of course, as known is still but relative. He says that if we would imagine our sensory and passive perception of objects replaced by an active, intellective "position," and our understanding or discursive synthesis by an original thesis or intuition we should get a power of "intellective intuition" which when exercised would be Creation, not the independent manifestation of an Other but the creation of itself. God is the ground of the objects that He intuits.

all Time then it must be thought of as outside of all Time, and its ground will lie in the being and activity of God as in Himself timeless but yet somehow coming into Time and so submitting Himself to the continuous movement of Duration. Creation must then be thought as a continuous act of conservation, which will be fully intelligible only when we have found a rational explanation of the relation of Eternity to Time.

Heaven and Earth

A. The scope of this work does not permit of discussion at any length of the various theories by which men have tried to explain the interaction of spirit and matter, or body and mind. It is enough to catalogue the principal varieties.

(1) Descartes, as is well known, was a pure dualist and regarded mind and matter as two created substances characterised severally by thought and extension as their determining attribute. The two are in a relation of reciprocal negation, and have nothing in common save this negative relation. It follows from this that soul and body are essentially distinct, and have but a mechanical connection. Man, therefore, is a machine which happens to be connected internally with something which thinks, but the thought in the soul and the extension in the body have again nothing in common. If the two happen to work peaceably together this is only because Descartes found an ontological argument for the existence of God. God is the one Substance which makes possible the harmony of its two derivatives.

(2) How this harmony was brought about was

shown by Geulincx, a disciple of Descartes, and by Malebranche, and was more thoroughly established by Spinoza. The first preached the famous doctrine of Occasionalism, which insists that neither mind nor body has any independent activity of its own but that a volition is an *occasion* by which God moves the body, and a feeling is an *occasion* by which He brings about a presentation of the external world. In other words, God has chosen to make two clocks which strike together, but it is His activity throughout which is the occasion of their synchronism. Malebranche's method of explanation was somewhat different. He denied that the two substances had more than a shadowy subsistence, and explained them as accidents of the one Substance which is God.

This view was carried out more thoroughly by Spinoza, who added as the consequence of his basal theorem, *omnis determinatio est negatio*, the denial of the position of Descartes that body and mind had peculiar attributes of their own. For, he said, were the one Substance, which is God, possessed of attributes, such as extension and thought, then it is determined, that is, negated. And this is what Hegel called acosmism ; it abolishes the antithesis of spirit and matter, and substitutes for them something which is neither and both at once, viz. God. The world disappears to Spinoza's thought.

(3) At the opposite pole of thought to Spinoza is Leibniz, the founder of modern Pluralism. With him God is not the one undifferentiated Substance, but Substance becomes a multiplicity of monads, each excluding all others, qualitatively alike, indivisible, and each according to its capacity representing or mirroring the universe by its own spon-

taneous energy. Leibniz then as a mathematician applies the *law of continuity* to explain the gradually ascending scale of perceptive power enjoyed by the monads; by his law of the *identity of indiscernibles* he establishes their diversity; and from the fact that each monad represents the same universe he deduces the law of pre-established harmony which is inherent in the monads and is not weakened by the fact that they represent the universe with varying degrees of perfection.

Leibniz's theory of the relation of soul and body regards body as we ordinarily know it as being an aggregate of monads. When one of them perceives the others so clearly that they are in comparison with it *monades nues*, it is said to be the ruling monad because it seems to rule, or otherwise the soul or entelechy of the aggregate or body. "Each soul or entelechy is surrounded by an infinite number of monads forming its body; soul and body together make a living being, and as their laws are in perfect harmony—a harmony established between the whole realm of final causes and that of efficient causes—we have the same result as if one influenced the other." [1] Locke had maintained that soul and body mutually influence each other; Geulincx that they provided "occasions" for parallel movement, but Leibniz said they moved together because of inherent pre-established harmony. A clock which makes another clock move illustrates the first; a clock made by the mechanician to move when another clock moves illustrates the second, while Leibniz's theory makes soul and body like two clocks so perfectly constructed from the first that they never vary.

[1] *Nouveaux Essais*, p. 714.

(4) The empirical school of Locke and Hume, continued by Mill and by defenders of Associationism in general, gave rise to the modern Realist school according to which body is the reality and mind a by-product of it. If we know nothing but the states of our mind, and these depend on the senses, since the senses are physical all we know consists of disconnected states of our sensory organism. Knowledge is atomistic and phenomenal. In that case no independent subsistence belongs to mind. It is to body as its shadow is to the engine, as the sound of striking is to the bell, that is, it is a by-product, an epiphenomenon. Hence science will set itself to explain all change and thought and feeling in terms of matter and motion, in terms, that is, of mechanism and not of life. Though realistic thinkers have contributed largely to the clearing of the issue they have now little influence in the philosophic world, and though they will always hold a considerable place in the history of thought, they are not likely to be remembered as having done more than make it impossible ever again to ignore the universal range of mechanism. That is, no doubt, a great achievement, but its very one-sidedness produced the inevitable reaction of Idealism.

(5) Idealism is the philosophic doctrine which "conceives of knowledge or experience as a process in which the two factors of subject and object stand in a relation of entire interdependence on each other as warp and woof." When this doctrine takes the form of a neglect of everything but the Subject and its states of consciousness, whether the things neglected be the objects of the external world, or other Subjects than the individual subject,

we get what is known as subjective or incomplete Idealism. And when in its protest against Realism, Idealism goes beyond its brief in attributing both mind and matter to an unknown potentiality, such as Mr. Herbert Spencer's Unknowable, then Idealism in seeking to be more thorough has ceased to be Idealism in the proper sense of the word. Modern Idealism has come to us from Berkeley, Leibniz and Kant through Hegel, and from Hegel all forms of current Idealism take their colouring and more. "What Hegel attempts to show is just that the categories by which thought must determine its object are stages in a process that beginning with the idea of 'Being,' the simplest of all determinations, is driven on by its own dialectic till it reaches the idea of self-consciousness." [1] Since Hegel's work the old dualism of matter and mind has ceased to have any philosophical importance, and has been succeeded by the duality of subject and object, along with which goes the recognition of the unity which embraces in one both subject and object, and all subjects and objects in one universal Mind. "What it (Idealism) cannot accept is the doctrine that there are two things which are two in themselves apart from that which makes them two—which are not *two of something*." [2]

(6) Lastly, to complete the catalogue of schools of thought which the Apostles' Creed has to allow for to-day, is the "radical empiricism" or pluralism, of which the late Professor W. James is the best-known exponent. Its protest is called forth by the tendency of some forms of Idealism to a one-sided intellectualism — of which Mr. Bradley is

[1] Caird, *Kant*, i. 443.
[2] J. H. Muirhead, in *Ency. Brit.* xiv. 285, 11th ed.

perhaps the most brilliant and Professor Bosanquet the most thorough-going representative. The Universe, according to the school of pragmatism, is not a "block universe," but rather a pluralistic; and God, for aught we know, may be not so much a Person as a Society of persons. Moreover, though the Will by itself is an abstract, as is Cognition by itself, yet the synthesis of Will and its object is as important as the Synthesis of Thought and its object. If the latter constructs for us our universe so does the former. In fact our Thought works only in the interest of our Will, and Will is the active expression of the needs of Life. The affinity of the philosophy of M. Bergson to that of Voluntarists of the school of William James is obvious.

A thoroughly intelligent interpretation of the clause of the Creed "maker of heaven and earth" must be able to assimilate the mathematical demonstration of mind and matter given by Descartes, the rationalistic given by Locke and Hume, the critical philosophy of Kant, the absolute idealism of Hegel and the pluralism of pragmatists. For all are expressions of what Hegel calls dialectic, the movement of Thought from sameness through difference to unity, the continuous attempt to give unity of thought to the manifold of experience, to see the One in the Many and to find God as in some sense the "maker of heaven and earth."

An Idealism which has already displaced materialistic Monism, and is already on the way to getting rid of an agnostic Monism, and offers instead a philosophy which does full justice to the duality of subject and object in Thought, and as well to the duality of Will and object in Conation, is the philosophy which best accords with the postulates

of the Creed of the Christian. It will also dispose of the fallacy contained in the saying "Tat tvam asi," (Thou art That), when understood to abolish the distinction between God and Man by making the latter a passing phase of the former. As Professor James Ward says: "The essential characteristic of experience we have found to be a duality in unity. As dualism is incompatible with the unity of experience so naturalistic Monism is incompatible with the duality," [1] so we may say of the spiritual Monism of India that it ignores the duality of subject and object. To confound Mysticism with this unsatisfactory Monism would be to do Mysticism a great injustice.

For Christian Mysticism has always held that the two terms God and Man co-exist. God and the Ego, while at bottom consubstantial, yet stand over against one another, for God respects, and, as the mystic believes, will always respect the Ego in which he has combined "heaven and earth," as a miniature representation of Himself in His self-revelation. Hence the Christian mystic, while admitting, nay, insisting that Spirit and Matter are two terms of a relation the nature of which defies all rational explanation, yet holds that another faculty knows how to unify them for all practical purposes—the faculty of Love—for it overleaps the distinctions established by Reason for its own ends, and unites both subject and object, spirit and matter in a deeper synthesis.

B. In saying this, we have already passed to the second head which tells how the mystic harmonises "heaven and earth" in his own life. He refuses to interpret the two terms as spatial,

[1] *Naturalism and Agnosticism*, ii. 207.

but finds instead such an interpretation as that of St. Augustine more to his mind who, when dealing with the word "heaven" as it occurs in the Lord's Prayer, says, humorously enough, that if spatial relations were intended, the birds in the air, or the dwellers on the hills, or tall men would have the advantage of nearness to God. We must, therefore, obey the religious feeling which assigns to God the noblest dwelling-place, and say that as heaven is better than earth, so is soul better than a material heaven, and a holy soul better than a sinful soul. Hence the invocation, "Our Father which art in Heaven," is to One whose dwelling-place, Heaven, is in the soul which lives in and by love.[1]

This love of the beautiful thing—less exactly described as the Beauty in the thing[2]—it is which explains why the mystic as such regards with some unmerited disdain the attempt of the philosopher to give a rational account of the world as distinct from the judgment of value given by religion. He is not directly interested, for example, in M. Bergson's conjecture that matter is spirit inverted (as Satan has been styled "Deus inversus") and left behind in the onward rush of life, so as to serve as a drag on the wheel or a stick to the rocket, or in the accompanying conjecture that the species is life petrified, while the individual (so far as it does not

[1] Cf. *Sermo* lvii., Bened. ed. 333: "Spiritus noster coelum est, caro terra." Cf. *De Dono Perseverantiae*, iii. 6, Bened. ed. x. 824, "Vult autem ille doctor et martyr coelum et terram intelligi spiritum et carnem"; *De sermone Domini in Monte*, vi. 22, Bened. ed. iii. pt. 2, p. 209, "Fiat voluntas tua sicut in coelo et in terra—sicut in sanctis et justis ita etiam in peccatoribus"; or, "Sicut in ipso Domino nostro Jesu Christo ita et in Ecclesia" (*ibid.* § 24).

[2] "We have almost ceased to speak of beautiful objects, *i.e.* we forget that what we call *beautiful* is originally a mere adjective determination not existing apart from a subject" (Lotze, *Microcosmus*, i. 629).

conform to the species) is an instance of Life seeking for fuller manifestation.[1] Such half-poetic, half-philosophic imaginings have their strong appeal to the mystic, but as subsidiary supports only. Like St. Paul, he has had his Damascus day, and ever afterwards that experience is the focus which determines the worth of all other things. For the Voice that has spoken within is a voice that had summoned into consciousness the love for all living things which heretofore had slumbered, and before Love all other faculties bow their head.

> I found God there, his visible power;
> Yet felt in my heart, amid all its sense
> Of the power, an equal evidence
> That his love, there too, was the nobler dower;
> For the loving worm within its clod
> Were diviner than a loveless God.
>
> R. Browning, *Christmas-eve*, 5.

The same sort of intimate affection colours also the mystic's interpretation of *Maker*. The notion of an outside force brought to bear on an external object, of God standing, as it were, a handbreadth off to contemplate His creature, is too frosty and harsh a conception to satisfy the heart of love by which the mystic lives. He therefore passes by instinctively any explanation of the type known as the "carpenter-theory of the Universe" as unworthy and therefore unacceptable.

Nor is he much more enamoured of the explanation which flourishes in theosophic soil and seeks

[1] "It is only among brutes that conformity to the type is regarded as a perfection; among men it is more in accordance with the ideal that the special nature of each individual should impart to his conduct (of which the general outlines are the same for all) its characteristic tone and colour" (Lotze, *Microcosmus*, ii. 24).

to do the impossible and undesirable task of piercing to the origin of things by postulating—for proof is out of the question—a gradation of emanations from the Supreme God. No matter how indefinitely large the number of these emanations may be, they can never be more than luminous mists of speculation which conceal the absence of a bridge between God and the World by diverting the spectator's attention from both sides of the chasm alike. Gnostic speculations of this sort have their value as diagrammatic settings-forth of rationalistic endeavours to construct a connected cosmogony, but immediately their artificial character is taken to be real they cease to be permissible and become pernicious.

The difficulty is removed by that sacramental view of the world which is common to all Christian mystics. Their asceticism takes the form of an intellectual refusal to deal with the beginning or end of the world, to search into the unsearchable, or to anticipate a heaven beyond their reach. They are content with what has been revealed to them individually, and they think they see clearly enough that the vision vouchsafed to one is not unique, or exceptional, or different in type from the vision vouchsafed to others, and as the vision came to them in symbolic form, so does the vision that comes through things of the external world. God in His world, in each common thing of that world, is enough for them; they shrink equally from any suggestion to set Him as a subject over against the world, or to make Him the one end of an emanational chain which by some jugglery changes its nature before it comes into our hand. By love they welcomed Him when He spake to their heart, and the same love enables them to see Him in all things

around them and within them. "We are in Nature, by essence and destiny, *nati*; and only in Nature is good possible for us and appreciable by us." [1]

In saying this the mystic is explicitly accepting as a postulate the existence of a higher world which imposes on our reason a standard of values, not as the results of experience, but as the *prius* of all experience. The light that comes to the Reason from this higher realm through what the schoolmen called *synderesis* [2] is what Kant apparently meant by *Vernunft* (Reason) as distinguished from *Verstand* (Understanding). But it is diagrammatic thought alone which erects a barrier between thought and will, as if they were independent faculties. In reality this higher impulse at once fills the Reason and stirs the emotional and conative side. It is supernatural in the sense that the source whence it comes is other than subjective, and is not due to the automatic working of the sub-conscious self, but not supernatural in the sense that the natural faculties are wholly passive as if indifferent or suffered no modification, conscious or unconscious from the impact of the higher force. "Above all natural objects is the divine presence which is known—by special divine favour—not as an abstract idea resulting from meditation, but as the immediate object of love, in the rapture or exaltation of the soul above itself which is the effect of love whether natural or supernatural. Thus 'he that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit.'" [3]

[1] Récéjac, *Bases of the Mystic Knowledge*, 1899, p. 65.

[2] St. Thomas Aq. defines it thus: "Synderesis non quaedam specialis potentia est ratione altior, vel ut natura, sed habitus quidam naturalis principiorum operabilium, sicut intellectus habitus est principiorum speculabilium, et non potentia aliqua" (*Summa*, 1. qu. 79, 12).

[3] A. B. Sharpe, *Mysticism*, 1910, p. 79.

CHAPTER VII

THE SECOND ARTICLE

And in Jesus Christ, His only son, our Lord

Καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν [τὸν] Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν

MAN shares with all things around him the dignity of being a divine Idea which is "the formless permanent ground of changing forms,"[1] and as such he is an Incarnation of the eternal Word. The ordinary mind looking at him sees only the "changing forms," the temperament, the mood, the fleeting opinion, but the divine eye sees "the permanent ground" trying to express itself through the changing forms. A constant type of this doublesidedness of existence is to be seen in the union of spirit and body. "There is nothing which approaches so nearly the incarnation of the Word as the union of spirit and body . . . and this resemblance would be even more complete if the spirit were one and the same for all men as has been claimed by some. If we accept this hypothesis we should only have to say that Spirit had renewed the act of its union with that which proceeds from human conception. It is in this sense

[1] Lotze, *Microcosmus*, i. 556.

that we say in the Athanasian Creed: 'As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.' . . . But nevertheless this comparison is incomplete; the Word could unite itself to our nature in a oneness much more wonderful than that in which the spirit is united to the body . . . because the intellectual nature already participates in the Word in an eminent oneness." [1] Hence it is that the mystery of the "Incarnation" is the mystery of "Creation." "The 'passage from the Absolute to phenomena,' or, inversely, from 'phenomena to the Absolute,' is almost the sole content of both the one and the other. The word 'Creation' answers to the mystery of Force, and the supreme mystic fact, the Christ, answers to the mystery of Reason. The first would explain how from one came the manifold, and the second how the manifold returns to one." [2]

If, then, it is true that the mystery of Incarnation is the mystery of Creation, it is also true that the mystery of Christ is the mystery of every man. Man, each man, is the "little flower in the crannied wall" defying explanation. Nor must we be deterred from equating these mysteries by the objection that the difference between Jesus Christ and each of us is a difference not of degree but of kind. Is it of Him as God or as man that we draw this

[1] St. Thomas Aq. *Summa contra Gentiles*, iv. 41.

[2] Récéjac, *Bases of the Mystic Knowledge*, p. 110. Récéjac also adopts the symbol of the Bride and Bridegroom in John iii. 29, expounding the Bride as Divine Reason and Christ, the Bridegroom as "the fulness of intellectual life and the mystical life." He then quotes St. Augustine (*Conf.* xi. 8): "When we are admonished by the mutable creature we are led to the immutable truth, where we learn indeed, when we stand and listen to him and rejoice greatly because of the voice of the Bridegroom restoring us to whence we are."

distinction? If as God, then seeing that we are speaking not of God as Absolute but as manifesting in man, how can there be a difference of *kind* between God manifest in Jesus Christ and God manifest in, say, Socrates? If as man, then is not man the name we give to ourselves as finite forms of the Infinite? Would it not be better and more true to say what the late Professor Moberly said? "As God He does this; and as man He does that, and another thing partly as God and partly as man. This distinction has been very prevalent indeed in the language of Christians. Assuredly, no kind of irreverence was intended, nor any reality of dualism. Yet the language, on cross-examination, will be found to be largely dualistic. The phrase 'God and man' is of course perfectly true. But it is easy to lay undue emphasis on the 'and.' And when this is done—as it is done every day—the truth is better expressed by varying the phrase. 'He is not two but one Christ.' He is, then, not so much God *and* man, as God in, and through, and as man."[1] We then draw the necessary conclusion that the difference, where all is divine, is of degree not of kind, that to each of us is given the Spirit proportionate to the capacity of our vessel, but that to Him the Spirit was given not by measure.[2]

If we are asked: "What sayest thou of God?" we reply that he that would see the Father must see Him through the Son,[3] and if we are then asked: "What think ye of Christ?" we can but first enquire what the enquirer thinks of man. If he thinks of man as merely a member of the pheno-

[1] *Atonement and Personality*, 1901, p. 96. [2] John iii. 34.
[3] John xiv. 9.

menal order Christ and God will be empty names. If, on the other hand, he thinks of man as potentially Divine he will have struck into a path which will in time lead him to know what Christ is and what God is. " The fact is that most of us are not able to attribute any such meaning to the word ' Divine ' as will enable us to use that word of Christ unless we have first seen God in Christ Himself. To ask whether Christ is Divine is to suggest that Christ is an enigma while Deity is a simple and familiar conception. But the truth is the exact opposite to this. We know, if we will open our eyes and look, the life and character of Christ; but of God we have no clear vision. ' No man hath seen God at any time.' " [1]

It will be seen, then, that the interest of the mystic in Christ (not in Christology) is deep and close, for his interest in man is more than that of most, and man's dignity and destiny in turn are bound up with Christ. For man is, as he believes, a unitary being with three modes, the psychical, the spiritual and the Christ, or if the psychical be split up into the hylic and the psychical proper, then four. Nor must we think of this triplicity as consequential, in the sense that each lower stage must be worked through before the next higher is reached; on the contrary, all are there always, but now one is in the ascendant, now another, but when that which is perfect is come all will be there in harmony. Between the psychical and the spiritual, however, there is less distance than between the spiritual and the Christ. Between these two latter is a Death, the death which is the dark side of a birth. The Christ that is to be is

[1] W. Temple in *Foundations*, 1913, p. 214.

a glory which casts a bright shadow backwards, and so illuminates the preparatory stages and enables us to bear present ills because of the prize they fit us to receive.

In saying this we have adopted phraseology which is not quite precise, though in common use. The Gnostic division of each man and of men in general was into choic or hylic, psychical and spiritual with which St. Paul's trichotomy of body, soul, and spirit is in agreement. If we eliminate the soul, as in all probability we ought to do,[1] on the ground that it is but a convenient name for a supposititious Self of ordinary experience, standing midway between spirit and body and possessing, as it seems, qualities derived from both, then we have the two constituent factors of man's being. For it seems nearest to the facts to say that the Christ who is represented above as the higher third to soul and spirit should be regarded rather as the archetype of which each individual man is the ectype. He is the universal of which man is the particular, and the finding by man of himself as an individual in the proper sense of the word takes place when the particular rises to the universal which overshadows him, and the two are synthesised in the man born from above of the Spirit. He can then say with literal truth that he no longer lives but Christ lives in him, for by the mystic's paradox he has laid down his ψυχή but only to find it again, not now as merged or subsumed in his own individuated spirit, but as lost altogether in the process which has united that spirit with the Universal Spirit that we call the Christ. "For the Lord is that Spirit."

[1] See Chapter XXIII. below.

The conjunction of the two terms Christ and Jesus should not be passed by without a word of notice.[1] Indeed, their union leads us to the true solution of a problem which has divided good men and still divides them.

The much-discussed passage, Phil. ii. 5-11, gives us the key. Stripped of all theological afterthoughts, what it says is this: Christians should exercise humility and mutual service after the example of Christ Jesus. The supreme instance of these virtues in Him is to be found not in His life on earth, but in the Great Act prior to His existence on earth, in which He quitted His state of heavenly glory (ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ) to take on Him a condition of earthly lowliness (μορφὴν δουλοῦ), because His desire for service caused Him to conclude that self-abnegation (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε) was better than being like to God's being (ἴσα Θεῷ). Though the whole drift and colour of the passage is ethical rather than theological, yet it could not have been written by anybody who did not think of Christ as not only pre-existent but as pre-existent Man, even though His Manhood stood above the summit of our experience, and where, therefore, we have no foothold. For the context shows that St. Paul was not thinking of God as God but of the "historic figure Jesus Christ," nor of any angel, for he placed Christ as man above the angels.[2]

[1] In St. Paul's Epp. Christ Jesus appears over sixty times and Jesus Christ about the same number of times, so that it is hazardous to go beyond McGiffert's statement (*Apostles' Creed*, p. 114) that in either case what we have is "simply a proper name to designate the historic figure, Jesus Christ."

[2] Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 3, Col. ii. 18, Heb. i. 4, 6, Matt. xiii. 41, xviii. 10. Moreover the N.T. teaching of angels emphasises not their higher rank but their different condition and their function as ministers of God to man.

It is no wonder if this passage has been the lively centre of controversies about Christology, and if those controversies have shown that theology can easily take sides without dishonesty or weakness. But it is remarkable that theologians should have been so anxious to deduce theorems about the Divinity of Christ Jesus from this passage as to have overlooked the plain fact that it is concerned not at all with His Divinity, but solely with His humanity under two contrasted conditions. The reason why their attention was thus diverted may lie in the fact that the human pre-existence of Christ Jesus had been already ruled out of order by a postulate of the subconscious mind, because it might seem to bring back the neglected theory of the pre-existence of souls.

But it is just this theory which alone makes sense of the passage before us, and not only of this passage, but of the teaching of the N.T. in general, and of human life as known empirically.[1]

We have too long thought of man in terms of a life of threescore years and ten, and so been compelled to accept logical and moral *anomia*, which have left Religion half-dead on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho. Is a belief held by millions of devout souls through a hundred generations worthy of nothing more than a polite or contemptuous dismissal at the hands of other devout souls trained differently, or at the hands of philosophers ?[2]

[1] This subject will be discussed in Chapter XXIV., but it may be convenient to anticipate that discussion. See note at the end of this present chapter.

[2] Cf. Lotze, *e.g. Microcosmus*, i. 390, 471.

The passage before us suggests that a human Being who afterwards came to be historically known as Christ Jesus, One who had passed beyond the human limit, and attained to a transcendent height in the inner world of Reality, known technically as the Christ-stage, or as being ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, obeyed the eternal law of Love and left His high estate—not thinking it a mere personal possession for His own use—in order that He might take human form, become incarnated, and so save man in the only way that salvation can be his, viz., from within and not merely from without. For the same Law which urged Him to this act of incarnation must be, as all religious thinking will insist, the same Law which gives form to all spirits, and is not to be thought of, therefore, as acting then for the first time, nor for the last time. Not for the first time, for the Christ is defined in the N.T. as the "one who is (ever) coming" (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) into the world.[1] Not for the last time, because the statement of Matt. xxviii. 18 (whatever its authorship) is true in substance and in fact, and is the necessary presupposition of texts like Rom. viii. 10, "if Christ be in you"; 1 Cor. i. 24, "Christ the power of God"; Gal. ii. 20, "Christ liveth in me"; Gal. iv. 19, "till Christ be found in you"; Eph. iii. 17, "that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." What they say is that the Being who emptied Himself for us men and for our salvation *has thereby acquired as Man the power of again and again incarnating Himself in His saints.* The power that was His in Palestine, limited in space and time, has become a power over all things in heaven and in earth, that pertain to man's salvation, so that where the soul is worthy

[1] Matt. xxi. 9, John i. 27, iii. 31, iv. 25, etc.

the Lord Christ who is the eternal Spirit [1] enters in and dwells there.[2]

But is there then no special attribute of the "Christ Jesus" who descended which may at once emphasise His Divinity (so far as we may apprehend it), and help us to understand how when He descended He could be given a name, that is an authority, to which every knee should bow?

We think there is, and that it is the purpose of the least understood book in the N.T.—the fourth Gospel—to say what it is. Because its purpose has not been perceived, the denial that the prologue is an integral part of the Gospel has been possible. Yet the prologue is the key to the whole. It defines the dignity of the central figure by assuring us that the Christ who fills its pages was one with the Logos, that He was the ἀρχή (this seems the meaning of that difficult saying in John viii. 25) in whom the Logos dwelt, and that, therefore, His life-story (as that of a concrete historical personage) was unique, in that it was the life-story of one who before descending had achieved the mystic marriage and been united to the eternal Logos. This course of thought, based as it is on the authoritative documents, enables us to assert at once the uniqueness of the Manhood, the truth of the Godhead, and the union of both in a way which, while it causes wonder and worship, and surpasses our understanding, yet does no violence to our Reason, or to any truth that we know.

But so far this has not told us what there was in the Christ which He possessed when He ascended and did not possess when He descended. In what consisted the merit of that self-emptying which

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 17. [2] John xiv. 23.

won for Him a Name above every name, and a position of exaltation above all others? It could not have consisted in the abjuration only, for countless others of the human family have forsworn for love's sake all that they had—and what more could they do?—nor yet in the greatness of what was given up, for in the spiritual life quantity is a cipher. It must be found, therefore, in the very nature of the renunciation, in the end for which the renunciation was made. This is supplied by the Name itself at which every knee should bow, the name, Jesus.

At the Annunciation Mary was told that she was to call her child Jesus,[1] and to Joseph in a dream it was ordered that he should call His name Jesus, for He should save His people from their sins.[2] In accordance with this finger-post, the four Gospels uniformly in their narrative speak of *Jesus* as their subject.[3]

The Gospels then seem to say as plainly as can be said (and here the fourth agrees with the others) that what they are narrating is the story of One who bore the Name of Jesus defined as one who should save His people from their sins;[4] and it is

[1] Luke i. 31. [2] Matt. i. 21.

[3] The word "Christ" as applied to Jesus occurs in the Synoptists 31 times, in St. John 17, in Acts 29, in Rev. 4, and in the Epp. 293 times. The ratio between the Gospels and Epistles is not the only striking thing in these figures; in the Gospels where "Christ" is not a *title* it always occurs in the mouths of others than the Evangelists themselves. John i. 17 is probably a gloss and xvii. 3c certainly so. It may be thought that the use of the title Son of Man in the Synoptic Gospels should throw some light on the name *Jesus* and the title *Christ*. The meaning of this title, Son of Man, is discussed in an additional note at the end of this volume.

[4] A Ptolemy, an Augustus might save his subjects from their enemies; Jesus saves from sins, by conferring a life which lifts its recipient above the sphere where sin has its field of action. Cf. my article on Forgiveness in Hastings's *Dict. of Rel. and Ethics*, vol. vi.

His people He saves, *i.e.* those elect souls (=the Israel of the O.T., or the "remnant") who out of the mass of men were born again. (Note that all are potential subjects of this re-birth ; [1] observation, however, assures us that only a remnant in each generation are actually partakers of it, which failure may be taken as a further example of the necessity of the hypothesis of re-incarnation.) The importance of this statement lies in the fact that the Child already was "Christ" in His celestial state, and, therefore, since there are two poles between which all worthy human-life ordinarily swings, self-culture and self-devotion, He had exhausted the capacities of the former. He was able, therefore, to devote His whole earthly life to the service of those whose Elder-brother He had become, and that too in a department which held by implication all the rest, viz. in the spiritual department. He came that His flock might have life, spiritual life, for so only could they be saved from their sins, and accordingly He refused the rôle of social reformer,[2] or civil judge,[3] or theological divine,[4] and restricted Himself to the work of saving men from physical and psychical ills by the impartation of Life, that higher life which alone prevents the lower from disorder, or restores it when it has been disordered.

This restriction must be taken as regulative of the "all authority" of Matt. xxviii. 18, that is to say, His authority continues within the limits self-imposed from the beginning, and is not directly concerned with what we call the forces of Nature, or the mechanical world which hems us in. His

[1] 1 Tim. ii. 4. [2] Matt. xxii. 21. [3] Luke xii. 14.
[4] Luke xx. 38.

Name still remains "Jesus," for His functions remain the same, only their capacity is raised to the n^th, and their scope is extended to all who dwell in the heavens above, or on the earth beneath, or in the realms beneath the earth.[1] To Him, therefore, are we to look for grace to help in time of need, for personal communion, for inspiration, for guidance, for light on our path, for in Him the Father is seen and known, and through Him "all the authority" of the Father is exercised. Thus we are led to a conclusion on the Being to whom prayers should be directed not at all in accordance with that of the late Dean Stanley who deprecated prayer being made to Jesus. We are not bidden to pray to Him as apart from the Father, but as one who is, so to say, the very soul of the Father Himself, for in Him the Eternal Logos has taken form and then raised that Form to the right-hand of the Father in the continuous work of drawing the souls of men out of the realm of darkness into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

His only Son

Τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ

We are now in a position to say how to interpret the two clauses, "His only Son" and "our Lord," for the preceding remarks have at all events warned us off the impiety of wading into the depths of the Divine Being by means of speculative reason. What the Depth of the Divine Being may hide we neither know nor can know. But what we may know is what He has been able to reveal to us, and

[1] Phil. ii. 10.

that is in the last analysis what we ourselves mystically may have seen and heard, or what mystics of all peoples and nations and tongues have experienced and tried to tell us in tradition by word or deed of theirs. Hence the phrase, *τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ*, "His only-begotten Son," must be interpreted to mean that where all men are sons of God (potentially or actually) Jesus only is Son of God in the complete sense of that term. We can say nothing of what sons there may be in other worlds than ours, still less of what may be in the bosom of the Infinite, but we are bound to say, on the strength both of traditional Christianity and of daily-repeated revelations given to our brothers and sisters still in the flesh, that Jesus is Son of God in a sense which no other of the sons of men are. In Him is dwelling—here and now—"the full pleroma of the Godhead" so far as body can embrace it.[1]

To appreciate fully, however, the dignity conferred by the term "Only-begotten," reference should be made to the conception of God as Un-

[1] Col. ii. 9. That the title *μονογενής* as applied to Jesus has some connection with the aeon of the Gnostics is certain, though uncertain what it is. It occurs five times only as an epithet of Jesus in the N.T.—four times in the Fourth Gospel and once in 1 John iv. 9. As the Gospel refers to Beginning, Word, Light, Life, Man, and other Gnostic dignitaries, so does it to Monogenes, probably to recapitulate them all in Jesus Christ (Eph. i. 10). "Only," as in Ps. xxii. 20, xxxv. 17 of the one soul of man; in Tob. iii. 15, Luke vii. 12, ix. 38, Heb. xi. 17 of the only Son; or "beloved" in Gen. xxii. 2, 16, and elsewhere must be regarded as weak editions of "only-begotten." On the other hand, the term both in the Gospel and in the Creed is not applied to the Logos, but to the historic person Jesus Christ, and the sense in which the word "begotten" is used is the same as in the term "first-begotten" in Heb. i. 6, Rev. i. 5, where it refers to the Christian belief that Jesus Christ was the leader of those who rise from the life which is death through death to the life which is life indeed. Similarly, "only-begotten" would say that His rising is unique in the sense that it is the formal cause of the rising of all others. The "eternal generation of the Son" is not in question here.

manifest and God as Manifest. The religious name for the former is *Father*, and for the latter *Son*. Hence, especially in the Greek Fathers, our World, or if there be others, the totality of Worlds, is the Son, inasmuch as they in whole and in every part reveal what the Father has seen fit to reveal. But as the whole sky can be mirrored as perfectly in the dewdrop as in the ocean, or as all the colours of the rainbow may be found in the prism or on the butterfly's wing, so is the whole Universe as the cosmic Son of God focused in the historical Jesus Christ as the human Son of God. The title "Only-begotten" is intelligible as applied to the Universe, for how could there be any other competent to receive it? and might then be transferred to the human Son in whom the whole was recapitulated. Only it must be remembered that for some inscrutable reason the eternal Person became the Son in the sense defined above by submitting to the conditions of His earthly life. As God remains nevertheless a changeless Being when He by the very superabundance of His Life enters the World of Becoming, so the Son, whether cosmic or historic, does not cease to be of "one substance with the Father" when like His Father He submits to form, even though that form be that of a slave. The law of the macrocosm is the law of the microcosm.[1]

This conclusion is on all fours with that presumption of an underlying unity in all things from which mysticism takes its rise, and towards which

[1] Philo speaks of "the eldest Logos of God putting on Him the world as his garment," de profug. xx. (562 M); and also says that His garment is "a variegated product of the rational and sensible powers," *De mig. Abr.* xviii. (452 M). See Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria*, 1875, pp. 219 ff.

it is always striving through Love. "That Love makes two persons become one is the only pledge we have that the religious passion, the desire of the individual to become the universe, is not an illusion." But can two walk together except they be agreed? If we talk of our becoming the Universe through Desire, of becoming one with it through Love, as two human beings may become one, then we assume that the Universe itself is Personal, or at least that it is the Form through which a Person acts on us. Behind every object that strikes the mind, behind every individual soul, behind the whole Universe is the living Idea, at once Thought and Will, in which they all find their unity. If the cosmos then is the Son of God, if Jesus Christ be the Son of God, then for the same reason is every child of man a son of God, and not only a phenomenal being on whom sonship will some day somehow be conferred as a new and strange extra. "In whatever reason may consist, it is clear that the soul cannot receive the gift of a new faculty additional to its nature, unless it be so grounded in its constitution that it either must of necessity be evolved from it, or else might be evolved should favourable conditions supervene."[1] If, as St. Athanasius says, man may become Divine, then he already is so in germ, he already has some kinship with God Himself, and the mystic sense of the indwelling of God is a first, feeble glimmering ray of the glory which shines in the cosmic and historical Son of God. In this way the story of Jesus becomes the chart of each soul, in which are set out the principal "stations" on the road of life which each soul must observe if the "hope of glory" within

[1] Lotze, *Microcosmus*, i. 536.

is to become the noonday glory of the Beatific Vision.[1]

That the thesis here maintained of the identity of interest and of history between the Christ and His disciples is no fond thing vainly invented, will be made clear enough by a few quotations from authorities of repute. If Jesus Christ could say with absolute truth, "I and the Father are one," is it not the goal set before every man that he too should attain to consciousness of the same truth about himself? From the consciousness of man should he not strive to attain the consciousness of God? But let us call our witnesses.

Clement of Alexandria (*Protrep.* i. 8) says:

> And the Word himself now plainly speaketh to thee, shaming thy unbelief, the Word of God, I say, which became man that thou mightst learn from man how somehow or other man may become God.

Speaking of the way sailors while pulling at an anchor pull themselves towards it, he says:

> So too those who according to the gnostic life pull at God without intending it draw themselves towards God. For he that serves God serves himself. Therefore in a man's own contemplative life whoever diligently worships God also through his own sincere self-purification beholds in holiness the holy God. For continence abiding carefully in its place, watching over and considering itself unceasingly is made like unto God according to its power (*Strom.* iv. 23, 152).

---

[1] "However long it may take us to reach the Absolute, it is sometimes curiously near us in isolated episodes of life, and our attitude towards certain phases of consciousness, if not our positive actions, may be materially affected by the consideration of the greater or less adequacy with which those phases embody reality" (J. M. E. McTaggart, *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*, p. 253).

And again :

In very truth the gnostic is his own creator and demiurge, and being made like unto God he makes into a cosmos those who pay heed to his words (*Strom.* vii. 3, 13).

And in *Strom.* vii. 10, 56, he says that

gnosis leads to the deathless and final end, teaching the community of life that is to be between us and gods according to God.

Divine then is the gnostic and already saintly, bearing God and being borne by God (*ibid.* vii. 13, 82).

The same truth is expressed by Hippolytus in the last sentence of his *Refutation* :

For thou hast become God ; for God does not act as a beggar towards thee in having made thee a god to His glory.

And a little before in the same chapter he says even more explicitly :

These torments thou shalt escape by having been taught the God Who really is. And thou shalt have the body deathless and incorruptible, with the soul ; thou shalt receive a heavenly Kingdom, thou who didst live on the earth and gain Knowledge of the supercelestial Kingdom. In return thou shalt be a companion of God and fellow-heir of Christ, no longer the slave of lusts, passions, and diseases. For thou hast become God. For whatever thou didst suffer as man these regard as proper to thee as man ; but whatsoever things follow on God, these God hath promised to provide because thou hast been made God and art become immortal. This is the meaning of the saying : " Know thyself " ; that is " Know that thou hast been made God."

So Irenaeus (*Against Haer.* iv. 38. 4) :

For we find fault with Him because we have not been made gods from the beginning, but at first merely men, then at length gods.

And Athanasius says quite as strongly :

> The Word became flesh that He might make man capable of receiving Divinity (*Contra Ar.* ii. 59).
>
> He came in man that we might be made God (*De Incar.* 54).

Augustine in the West interprets similarly the work of Christ :

> It was for our sake that He was made partaker of our mortality, in order that we might be made partakers of His Divinity (*En. in Ps.* cxxxviii., Bened. ed. iv. 1535).

And Origen in his Commentary on John (bk. xxxii. 27) refers to 2 Cor. iii. 18, and says :

> When the Nous has been purified and has ascended above all material things in order that it may more thoroughly look into the contemplation of God, then through the things it contemplates it is divinised.

It would seem then that we shall be in excellent company if we say that of the perfected Christian at all events there holds true what is said throughout this chapter before us of the Christ.

Our Lord

Τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν

This clause forms a standing protest against any form of teaching which suggests, explicitly or implicitly, that man is his own Saviour, and needs but to develop for himself the powers of his own dormant Divinity. Such teaching has never been wholly wanting in earlier or later days, and indeed it dogs the footsteps of all thought which accentuates the immanence of God in His world. It is, however, the effect, not of that truth, but of a one-sided

application of it, and receives here its necessary correction in the statement that the Christian is not his own but is under the orders of another. That other is his Lord on a twofold ground, on the ground that He is Jesus, and on the ground that He is Christ. As Jesus He is the Lord who is active on the external side of the believer's life ; as Christ He is the Lord who is active in his inner life.

Let us take the latter first. It has been too hastily assumed that the title *Christ* is adequately explained when it is made to be a Greek translation of the Hebrew *Messiah*, and that therefore it would not have been found at all but for this latter. The difficulty in accepting this conjecture is to be found partly in the fact that the figure of the Messiah occupies so small a place in the O.T.,[1] and partly in the fact that the figure of the Christ in the N.T. fills the whole stage. It would be quite as probable that the weak figure of the Jewish Messiah is a shadow cast backward on Jewish religion by the all-dominant person of the Christ, as that the reverse is the case. If another conjecture may be hazarded where there is nothing certain, it would be that out of the eclectic mass which lay seething at the opening of our era in the Jewish crucible there emerged, under the auspices of the Divine Alchemist, a conception of a lofty grade of humanity known as the Christ, and that this was made actual in the person of the Saviour of the world. And as we are conjecturing we may as well go one step further, and say that there is nothing improbable in the suggestion that we owe to some one or other of the mystery-brotherhoods then existing this idea of

[1] The term occurs in the whole Bible only four times, in Dan. ix. 25, 26, John i. 41, iv. 25.

the Christ, an idea which they were competent to form but not to actualise.

However this may be, the references to the Christ in the N.T. make it clear that whether the term is used to designate the historic person of Jesus of Nazareth, or is used in a more subtle sense, in either case it denotes either One who actualised a divine Ideal that had become dear to the Greek soul, or that Ideal itself. The fact that He was described as the elect of God,[1] that His sufferings were ordained,[2] that He was the end of the law,[3] and the wisdom of God,[4] was better known not after the flesh,[5] could be formed in disciples,[6] is the head of the Church,[7] and our life,[8] all shows how the Greek conception of the Christ stands at the opposite pole to that of the Hebrew conception of the Messiah, and point us to the recognition of Christ as an inner principle in us, as synonymous, let us say, with that Divine thing in us which lies as the brooding, mysterious background behind our spirit, as our spirit lies behind our soul.

If this be the sense in which Christ is our Lord, then He is not Lord merely in the sense that He excludes all other powers from lording it over us, or calling on us for obedience, as, *e.g.* philosophy, or sensation, or the form-world around us in general, but still more in the sense that He as a positive Power sits enthroned in the innermost shrine of our being to claim us as His own and to rule us as His agents. Not only is our body His temple, for it is the "temple of the Holy Ghost,"[9] and "the Lord is the Spirit," but so is our soul, and so is our

[1] Luke xxiii. 35. [2] Luke xxiv. 26, Acts iii. 18. [3] Rom. x. 4.
[4] 1 Cor. i. 24. [5] 2 Cor. v. 16. [6] Gal. iv. 19.
[7] Eph. v. 23. [8] Col. iii. 4. [9] 1 Cor. vi. 19, 2 Cor. iii. 17.

spirit. We are Christ's as Christ is God's.[1] He is the hidden Man of the heart,[2] which is what the Hindu means by the little man seated in the pupil of the eye; and when Natural Theology speaks of the voice of conscience it refers, consciously or not, to this voice as being that of this inner Christ, and its declaration that this voice speaks with a "categorical imperative" rests on the fact that the Speaker is one who has the right to speak with authority. "In Ethics the main conceptions of the deliverance of the Moral Consciousness are two: Moral Duty, as imposing obligation; and Moral Goodness, as inviting acceptance—the conception of Law to be obeyed, and the conception of End to be achieved." [3]

We hear also of the *Lord Jesus* as well as of the *Lord Christ*, and though the two titles have a logical distinction they have none in fact, for both have the same subject. It was the Lord Jesus to whom Stephen commended his spirit,[4] in whose Name converts were baptized,[5] on whom men were exhorted to believe,[6] whose day would be the day of the Lord.[7] His form is concrete, as a great high-priest,[8] as a compeller of demons,[9] as having His martyrs.[10] He is not thought of as Christ is thought of, as being the Indwelling God, but as the transcendent (and descended) God; as One, therefore, who wears a human form,[11] and appears in it to His servants on occasion, and will appear again finally at the consummation of all things. If He as Christ is the Beauty and compelling Power of

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 23. [2] 1 Peter iii. 4.
[3] Caldecott, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 46. [4] Acts vii. 59.
[5] Acts viii. 16. [6] Acts xvi. 31. [7] 2 Cor. i. 14.
[8] Heb. iv. 14. [9] Acts xix. 15. [10] Rev. xvii. 6.
[11] Acts vii. 55, ix. 17.

the inner universe, Jesus is the attractive Force and Wisdom of the universe around us, which He uses according to the good pleasure of His will as His manifold instrument in His work as Redeemer and Saviour. We may not then fable of a Demiurge, but obey instead Him who ever creates and preserves; we must not allow our proper recognition of the universality of mechanism to oust our equally proper recognition of the universality also of the Purpose which God has for us in the Lord Jesus; we must refuse any place to despair or despondency because we cannot understand the mystery of this unfathomable world, or the meaning of history with all its twists and turns, or the plan of our own lives taken one by one. To acclaim Jesus as Lord is to rest content with Him teaching us as we are able to bear it, speaking the word of power, opening our blind eyes, melting our frozen hearts and hearing and answering our prayers.

Lastly, it is not to be supposed that the earliest disciples understood that in the Person of Him whom they treated as their Lord, *i.e.* as their Teacher, was implied One who both as Jesus and as Christ was destined to be universal Lord.[1] Reflection on their experience it was which first gave them this knowledge, and similar reflection has prepared a great army of mystics to be fit to receive in the silence the revelation that Jesus Christ is not only Lord of all, but to say (what is far harder) the same thing in the first person singular: "My Lord and my God."

[1] This assumes that Peter's confession of faith in Matt. xvi. 16 is the product of reflection on the "revelation."

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON PRE-EXISTENCE AND RE-INCARNATION

THE arguments usually advanced in favour of pre-existence (and re-incarnation) may be summarised as follows: (1) The inequalities of earthly life caused by heredity and environment, for which the individual is not responsible, and God cannot be held *immediately* to have caused without a shock to our moral sense. (2) The difference in capacities with which children are born; these seem best attributable to their own past experiences. (3) The analogy of the law of gravitation which suggests that souls are drawn to souls as atom to atom. (4) The general belief in the immortality of the soul joined to the want of any evidence that it ordinarily acquires immortality in this present earthly body; hence it must have been immortal before birth if it is after death. (5) As atoms are indestructible so *a fortiori* are souls. (6) The psychical base of Memory (for the physical see Samuel Butler's *Life and Habit*). (7) The law that the purpose in Nature is to produce the perfected Individual, and the observed fact that one life in the body is insufficient for this purpose. (8) The law which is conterminous with our experience, viz. that spirit is always embodied, and the inference that so often as the separated spirit needs the lessons of an earthly body so often will it be afforded the opportunity. (9) The prize generally accorded to that type of character which is rich in all-round experiences, and the impossibility of securing that type in perfection in a single earth-life. (10) The facts that this doctrine has enthralled (and does so still) more minds than any rival doctrine, and has satisfied such minds as Plato's and Origen's. (11) The fact that it alone gives any rational account of social inequalities, and alone, therefore, shows how social unrest can be quieted. (12) The inextinguishable desire to leave some memorial behind us: "yet in what would the attraction of such forms consist if it were merely attached to a name which no longer had an owner?" and how could the owner take full possession of his legacy but by coming back for the purpose? (13) There can be no philosophy of history, whether history be considered as the story of the education of mankind or the development of the Idea of mankind, unless every individual human remains to the end the subject of that education, or the conscious

spectator of that Idea. These are not supplied by the final judgment, and there is only left the hypothesis of re-incarnation. Lotze, who rejects this latter hypothesis as a dream, yet holds to the unity of history "in which all that has been inexorably divided by the temporal course of history has a co-existence independent of time; in which the benefits produced in time are not lost for those who helped to win but did not enjoy them"; and again: "The presentiment that we shall not be lost to the future, that those who were before us, though they have passed away from the sphere of earthly reality, have not passed away from reality altogether, and that in some mysterious way the progress of history affects them too—this conviction it is that first entitles us to speak as we do of humanity and its history" (*Microcosmus*, ii. 172, 174). The truth of these passages seems to lend support to re-incarnation.

If the doctrine of the pre-existent humanity of Jesus Christ be made plausible on other grounds, it may gain support from the consideration of one or two difficulties which without it seem insurmountable. According to Heb. iv. 15, Jesus was put to the test in all points as we are. But a considerable portion of the tests put to the average man spring out of his sensual nature. Impulses to the inordinate indulgence of the appetites, to sloth and ease, play a large part in the discipline of most of us at some part of our lives. Did Jesus feel them with the same complacency we feel towards them? If so how could the desire to do His Father's will be the master-passion it was? Can that will be done, as Jesus did it, by one who is still torn in two, or liable at any moment to be torn in two by volcanic forces which rise out of the abyss? And if He did not feel their full force as we feel it, in what sense can it be said that He was tempted in all points as we are?

Our worship of Him, indeed, seems incompatible with any conception of His character which represents Him as struggling, like St. Paul, with some "thorns in the flesh." If He were under the necessity of such a struggle our sympathy might possibly be more intense, but our veneration would be indefinitely lessened. Again, the men we know to whom we look up most unhesitatingly are those who somehow are at home on heights of purity, bravery, generosity, selflessness and wisdom, to which we are as yet strangers. Nor is our respect for such men made any the less by the knowledge that they have no need to fight for their footing inch by inch. If we

know that for many generations their ancestors have been unstained, so that the force of heredity is at its best, and that their environment has been adapted all along to the production of the finest type of human character, we are content to acknowledge the worth of the resulting product of such heredity and environment, and do not trouble ourselves with any reflection that these fine traits would be made more meritorious had they been attained after a fierce struggle with a tainted heredity and an unfavourable environment.

Yet a final judgment must surely be built on both factors, the two determinants on the one side, and inner freedom on the other. The man of supreme excellence whose goodness is, abstractedly considered, mechanically determined by the forces of heredity and environment, is aesthetically higher but perhaps morally lower than the less perfect character which still is contending and still bears the scars of recent wounds. We may admire a Kant, but our affection goes out to a Goethe. How is the aesthetic judgment to be harmonised with the ethical ?

The doctrine of pre-existence, with its corollary of re-embodiment, does at least seem to suggest a way in which this harmony can be brought about. If all good things grow with a slowness directly proportionate to the degree of their goodness, and if at the level of individuation the thing which is now become a person is capable of taking successive forms, then our difficulty seems removed. And the first of these pre-suppositions is matter of everyday observation. The second can hardly be denied by those who believe in a " spiritual body " with St. Paul, or in the resurrection-body of Jesus Christ. For, there is nothing more wonderful about a spirit assuming a new body at birth than about the same spirit resuming a body it had temporarily ceased to animate.

Hence, if Jesus Christ is to be thought of as at once tempted all along the line of human temptation, and also as the fair flower and fruit of human excellence, we seem driven to allow to His humanity a longer existence than that covered by thirty-three years. If threescore years and ten are all too short for our probation would thirty-three be enough for His ? If we answer this question in the affirmative we can only mean that the Divinity in Him annuls all question of probation. In which case He ceases to be our exemplar. But if He was man to the full, then the logical implicits compel us to infer

that His manhood possessed enough duration for a steady, orderly, and gradual evolution through experience. In other words, we must conclude to a previous existence enjoyed by Him as man. It may, of course, be said that such an existence does not involve necessarily re-incarnation, and that human life may, for all we know, be lived under other conditions than those known to us here. This is so. But as we have no knowledge, and no authoritative hint even of such modes of human living, it seems better to stick closely, at all events till we know more, to what we do know, and to say that re-incarnation is the more probable.

In this case we have time enough on our hands for all our needs. The type of excellence we revere has no need to defend itself against sensualism now, but it has fought it in a previous existence and conquered. Hence our reverence can be tempered now with sympathy without any loss. On the other hand, the soul still struggling in the depths and so extorting our sympathy may at the same time evoke in us some accompanying reverence from the vision of the excellence it will hereafter attain in some other form of existence.

It should be observed carefully that no question is raised by this line of thought which touches on the Divinity of Jesus Christ. The present writer, in any case, has no doubts or reservations in connection with that fundamental truth of Christianity. The only question raised is whether, if we seek to find a rational explanation at all, we are to choose creationism, traducianism, or re-incarnation as the best hypothesis, best in the sense that it gives a more coherent account of the facts than any other hypothesis. And it would seem that the laws of Thought compel us to attempt to rationalise our experience. So that we come to our judgment of Paris, and are disposed to conclude, unlike Paris, that all three hypotheses may be in correspondence with truth, and are each of them indeed but partial aspects of the whole.

Thus traducianism explains by common consent the peculiarities of our physical system, and so is but an older and perhaps not a better name for *heredity*. Re-incarnation declares that the Ego, the bearer of mental and spiritual *propria*, is not a Self, such as the extreme Indeterminist dreams of, without a history or a relative permanence. On the contrary, it maintains that the evolution of any being presupposes a *continuum* which precedes manifestation and remains constant before, through

and after all manifestation. And as in the case of the Self this *continuum* is of an intellectual rather than a sensitive nature, this affords a further reason for rejecting the theory that parents do more than provide a physical form for a persistent entity to manifest through. Lastly, creationism insists that the act which unites the persistent spiritual principle to the transeunt body is not merely the meeting-point of blind mechanical forces, but is a spiritual act of God's purposive will, equally inconceivable as that by which all things are being continuously created, and strictly analogous to it. And it would seem that this is all that the most earnest supporter of the Logos-doctrine is concerned to defend. If in this short note a greater emphasis is laid on the re-incarnation aspect of the transaction of birth this is only because this is the one which has been made the Cinderella of the three sisters.

It has, of course, been assumed throughout that whatever may be the conditions of human life in general these are also the conditions of the human life of Jesus Christ. That He is "perfect God and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting," bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, is so thoroughly in accord with all Christian experience, so much the woof to its warp, that it is now an axiom accepted by all. Hence we are at liberty to pass freely from our conditions to His, and conversely, when we are attempting to set out a consistent account of human origins.

The union of God and man in Christ Jesus is, that is to say, typical of the union of God with every man who comes to share the Christ-life. Not jealous solitariness, but pre-eminence is the prerogative of Jesus Christ, and this is set out in the statement that He is the first-born among many brethren.[1] For the same Spirit which was His Life is also the life of His followers, and its function is to quicken them, including their mortal bodies.[2] As He was, so are we in this world,[3] *i.e.* He was a Divine Being subjected to the law of generation, passing through this world to the world of Reality. The same is true of us. Whatever difference there is, is one of degree, not of kind. As Bede says: "The term *as* imports similarity, not equality. For if we were made in the image of God, why are we not as God? We are not equal, but are like Him, according to our capacity."

[1] Rom. viii. 29. [2] Rom. viii. 11. [3] 1 John iv. 17.

St. Athanasius says that God became man that man might become God, and similarly St. Augustine says: "The love of the world calls: lay hold on Christ, He became under Time that you may become of the Eternal order." And again: "If you love earth you will be earth. If you love God—shall I not say it?—you will become God. I do not venture to say this of myself, but let us hear the Scripture, saying: 'I have said ye are gods and the children of the Most High.'"

But whatever truth there may be in the above arguments and others like them, we have yet to ask whether the tradition of the Catholic Church has allowed any place to the doctrine of Re-incarnation. Did any of the Fathers teach it? Does the N.T. teach it? or does it at least permit it? [1]

A certain presumption that it does is offered by the well-known fact that this doctrine was in some form or other common to all the lands surrounding that which produced our N.T. Egypt, Chaldea, Persia, India, the Mysteries, the Orphic, Stoic, and Pharisaic doctors all inculcated it. To use the words of the late Dr. Liddon with reference to the prevalence of this doctrine of pre-existence in early Christian days: "It found its way to Alexandria. It was adopted by the Neo-Platonist thinkers, and even in the Jewish schools; it was taught by Philo, as well as by Plotinus; it was filtered through Essenism into the religious philosophy of the Talmud and the Cabbala; it entered into more than one type of Gnosticism; it appears among the other eccentricities of the eccentric Origen; it forms a link between the philosophical bishop of Cyrene, Synesius, and the outer world of Pagan thought" (*Some Elements of Religion*, p. 95, ed. 1904). It is somewhat strange after this to find that the utmost that Liddon can advance on the other side is that the doctrine "was stoutly opposed by the immense majority of Christian teachers, and was finally condemned by the collective Church as an untenable error." [2]

---

[1] In some of what follows I have followed a discussion of this subject which appeared in *St. Ethelburga's Leaflet* for July and August 1912.

[2] It is said that the fifth General Council held at Constantinople in 553 in its first Canon decreed: "If any one affirms any mythical pre-existence of souls and any monstrous restitution following on it, let him be anathema" (Labbé, *Councils*, vol. ix. col. 395). But there is strong reason for believing that the attribution to the Fifth Council of the fifteen anathemas (of which that cited above is the first) is a mistake, and that the Canons

If then the N.T. rejected so widely-spread and so fundamental a doctrine we might *a priori* expect that the rejection would be explicit. This, however, is certainly not the case. Instead, what evidence we have, scanty and ambiguous as it may be, leans, to say the least, in the direction which favours the doctrine. The popular belief that Jesus was an Old Testament worthy come back (Matt. xvi. 14), or that He was John risen from the dead (Luke ix. 7); the enquiry whether the blind man was blind in punishment for some pre-natal sin (John ix. 2), if not conclusive, do at least, so far as they go, witness to the prevalence of the belief that the soul is pre-existent to physical birth. It is undeniable, however, that the N.T. teaches the pre-existence of Jesus Christ, and this not merely in the sense that the "Word of God" is pre-existent. The classical passage for this is of course Phil. ii. 6, which states quite plainly that Christ Jesus existed, but in a divine form, before He vouchsafed to assume a human form. But no Christian thinker has ever suggested that Christ Jesus before taking our human form belonged to the order of those higher intelligences whom we classify generically as angels. From which it seems to follow that He was man before the Incarnation. But this is only to say that He was a Being who was a permanent centre of spiritual force, in short, that He was a soul pre-existing in the "form of God."

The Nicene Creed asserts this pre-existence when it says that (1) He came down from heaven, which implies that He was already there before coming down; (2) that He became incarnate, *i.e.* that He added to His human soul a physical body of the human pattern, and, therefore, that He became Man phenomenally (and completely) as He was already Man essentially.

This is essentially the position taken up by Weizäcker, who says that St. Paul's words establish two results:—"In the first place, He had a personal existence before His human birth, and in the second, His earlier life was divine, and absolutely opposed to the dependent life of man upon earth. His Divinity is here defined as a generic idea by this contrast with a servile

---

are the reply of the bishops assembled in a Home Synod, under Mennas, the patriarch of Constantinople, to a tractate of the most pious Emperor, Justinian, given in Labbé, vol. ix. cols. 487-538. Cf. Smith, *Dict. Xtian. Biog.*, art. "Origenistic Controversies," vol. iv. pp. 152-6.

position, and therein lies the conception of a supramundane existence which is not inconsistent with the uniqueness of God the Father, nor for that very reason precludes the notion of Christ having been created by Him. Had he (St. Paul) not given his doctrine of Christ this backward extension, the human life of Christ would have become for him a sort of impersonal event, and Jesus a mere instrument. His doctrine of the pre-existence accordingly enables him to look upon Christ's work as a personal act, and to preserve the bond between Him and humanity." [1]

Christian theology, indeed, has always felt instinctively that all attempts to state the life and work of Christ Jesus in terms of ordinary human life are to be resisted. It has not, however, while asserting the Divinity of Christ Jesus, done at all times full justice to His manhood. For the truth of man's pre-existence, if it be a truth, does undoubtedly add to his stature and augment his dignity. In any case, the quickening of consciousness by the Eternal Spirit in us men of to-day has made it impossible for us to rest content with the exiguous term of threescore years and ten. We claim kinship with the angels and hitch our waggons to the stars. As Christians, moreover, we see in Christ Jesus ourselves ennobled; His life-history is our life-history in record and in prophecy—in record because He has not destroyed in Himself the lowly elements which are His and ours, but transmuted them; in prophecy, because we too shall be raised with Him to the super-human.

If we were invited to ignore Hooker's warning and to wade into depths beyond our reach, we should be disposed to say, and to say it with the whispered humbleness of devotion, that the Logos-doctrine and that of pre-existence are quite conceivably compatible. We might suggest that this great human Soul had become perfect through many lives—whether embodied again and again on this planet or elsewhere makes little difference—and that now being free from the law which subjects man to " the wheel of nature " He voluntarily offered Himself to the Eternal Word as a " minister of the circumcision for the truth of God " and for the salvation of man. This voluntary self-surrender was at once met with a hypostatic union of the

[1] *Apostolic Age*, Eng. trans. i. 146; cf. also Vincent in *Internatl. Crit. Commentary*, " Philippians," pp. 78-90.

Eternal Word which lifted the pre-existing soul to a higher plane, made it to constitute a *super-man* if we may use (with a difference) the phrase of Nietzsche, and then sent forth this super-human soul into the world of generation to be the first-born among many brethren and the father of a new race of men.

Again, Catholic theology has delighted to honour Mary by asserting that the world's redemption had long waited for the time to come when a maiden should be possessor of that purity which should enable the Redeemer to be born of her. But this leads inevitably to the equal and parallel affirmation that the world's redemption had waited also for a human soul of such power and purity that it could be exalted to the lofty work of Redeemer. When that soul was ready and was anointed with Divinity it could be literally said of it that in it " dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead in bodily form."

But this dwelling with us of God as man was not the condescension of a superior being who seeks to shame or to allure to better living by external example, or by precept, or by any merely external influence. It was rather the formation of a new and higher type of manhood which might act as a school, or society, or temple, or body in which every man might find his place, where the same life might thrill through all, where every member might go from strength to strength. That which makes this possible as a pre-condition is the pre-existence of all that bears the form of man.

The remark made above that Re-incarnation has been neglected by Christian thought is borne out by the fact that Origen, almost alone of all the Fathers, taught it explicitly, even though tentatively. It would be an interesting chapter indeed in Christian origins which gave the causes for the disappearance of the doctrine, but the chapter still remains unwritten, nor is this the place for it.

Origen, commenting on John i. 6, says : " If the Catholic opinion holds good concerning the soul as not propagated with the body, but existing previously and for various reasons clothed in flesh and blood, this expression ' sent from God ' will no longer seem extraordinary as applied to John." We may account for the scarcity of such testimony in several ways. We may say that Origen was more or less heretical and that little, therefore, should be built on him.

Other statements of Origen bearing on this subject are contained in the following extracts:—

"With respect to the soul, whether it is derived from the seed by a process of traducianism . . . or whether it has any other beginning; and this beginning itself, whether it be by birth or not, or whether bestowed upon the body from without or not, is not distinguished with sufficient clearness in the teaching of the Church" (*De principiis*, Preface).

Again discussing the reasons why souls are acted on at one time by good spirits and at another by bad, and after referring to the cases of John the Baptist, Jeremiah, and others, he says that he suspects that the grounds are older than "the bodily birth of the individual." He concludes that "those who maintain that everything in the world is under the administration of divine providence can give no other answer . . . than by holding that there were certain causes of prior existence," in consequence of which different souls on account of different merits "are immediately on their birth, or even before it, assorted by divine providence for the endurance of either good or evil" (*De principiis*, iii. 3).[1]

[1] Alger has an interesting discussion of metempsychosis (pt. v. ch. ii. pp. 475-487) in which he does justice to the extensive, controlling, and permanent influence of the doctrine, and sums up its species as setting forth either "a development, a revolution, or a retribution." He accounts for the prevalence of the belief by early man's consciousness of personal identity through all change, including therefore that of birth as well as of death; by the observed resemblances between men and other animals; by that disease of language which takes a metaphor literally; by dim memories of similars; by its power to vindicate the ways of God to men; and by the authority of philosophers. He admits that the doctrine is hard to be resisted; that it charms the understanding and the conscience; that it echoes with dreamy sweetness through the deep mystic chambers of our being, and commands deference and deserves study as the undisputed creed of millions of our race for perhaps over a hundred and fifty generations. But he concludes that "based on shadows and on arbitrary interpretations of superficial appearances, built of reveries and occult experiences, fortified by unreliable inferences, destitute of any substantial evidence, it is unable to face the severity of science," and that therefore, "a real investigation of its validity by the modern method dissipates it as the sun scatters fog" (pp. 483-4). It can hardly be said, however, that Mr. Alger applies to the subject any "real investigation." But cf. Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism*, ch. v.; Beausobre, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, lib. vi. ch. iv.; Helmont, *De revolutione animarum*; Richter, *Das Christenthum und die ältesten Religionen des Orients*, sects. 54-65; E. D. Walker, *Re-incarnation*.

CHAPTER VIII

THE THIRD ARTICLE

Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary

Τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου

"The complete form of this Article in our Creed is almost unknown in all the Creeds, except those which can be proved to be derived from it. It must, therefore, have been peculiar, we do not know for how long, to the South Gallican Church, to which we owe our recension of the Creed." [1] The Creed, as given by Irenaeus and Tertullian and in the form of the Old Roman Symbol, was content to recite: "Who was born of Mary the Virgin." In this form, as McGiffert insists, the authors were more concerned to assert the reality of Christ's manhood against gnosticism than the truth of His Divinity.[2] The difficulty of accounting for the later expansion of the article is part of the problem of the growth of Christology. The N.T. gives no coherent system on this head, but shows us plainly that reflection on the marvel of Christ's Personality had begun but not concluded its work.

[1] Zahn, *Apostles' Creed*, p. 117. [2] *Apostles' Creed*, pp. 122-126.

For example, two solutions of His human greatness were offered, one scholastic and one popular. The former, which is that of St. John and St. Paul, accounted for it, the one by His pre-existence in a state of heavenly glory, and the other by His being united to the Eternal Word. On the other hand, the Gospel of the Infancy as given by St. Matthew and St. Luke sets out with rare beauty the poetical interpretation born of popular instinct.[1] The latter possesses the advantage of the rule that the popular judgment is always right in substance on all matters submitted to it, even though it is ordinarily mistaken in its judgment on the form, or in its weighing of evidence, or drawing of conclusions. On the other hand, the learned hypotheses of academically trained minds such as those of St. Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel are apt to be little more than the expression of a personal philosophy, though here again we must recollect that both of these were more and greater than thinkers—they were devout Christians who had put their hypotheses to the test in their lives.

It may sound odd to say that it is not necessary in a work such as this to enter on a discussion of what is called the Virgin-birth of Christ, but the omission is justifiable for these reasons :

(1) The question is purely a question of history and has little or no connection with religion, and being a question of history it falls to students of history for investigation. But it may be pointed out that the truth or otherwise of the historical fact is

[1] "The miraculous genesis of Christ in the Virgin by the Holy Spirit and the real pre-existence are of course mutually exclusive. At a later period it became necessary, it is true, to unite them in thought" (Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. 105).

not affected by its subsequent adoption by doctors, or by the Church generally. The duty would still remain for the enquirer to set out the extant evidence and to test it by the ordinary canons of historical criticism. When this was done it would be found that the belief rests in the last analysis on the stories of the Infancy in the first and third Gospels. But what previous history it had, or whence these two documents derived their material, remains still a dark field for conjecture.

(2) It seems clear that the doctrine of the Virgin-birth was not included in the original evangelical deposit.[1]

(3) A physical fact in and for itself has no religious worth. The Divinity of Jesus has no necessary connection with the mode of His taking flesh.[2]

(4) If the ground offered for believing in a physical Virgin-birth be that otherwise the human nature of Jesus would have no guarantee of purity, a strong protest should be lodged against the anti-Christian judgment implicit here which stigmatises an ordinance of God as unclean, and so passes over to the Manichaean camp.

(5) Finally, if the emphasis laid on the doctrine

[1] "The evidence of our Lord's birth of a virgin was no part of the original Apostolic testimony, and still to-day this question is not a ground on which belief is asked" (Bishop Gore, Lecture at St. Philip's, Birmingham, December 10, 1902, see *Nineteenth Century*, November 1904, p. 752). Cf. also what Dean Armitage Robinson wrote in his famous Open Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury: "To say that the historical fact of the Virgin-birth is a cardinal doctrine of the faith is to use language which no Synod of Bishops, so far as I am aware, has ever ventured to use. It is to confuse the Incarnation with the special mode of the Incarnation in a way for which Christian theology offers no precedent."

[2] It is noteworthy that Theodotus, the leather-worker, taught that Jesus was a man who, by a special decree of God, was born of a Virgin through the operation of the Holy Spirit.

of the Virgin-birth is due not so much to its historical character, as to its being the symbol of the unique moral purity of Jesus Christ, then though the object aimed at is in every way laudable, yet it is weakened rather than strengthened by the proof tendered. A direct presentment of the life has never failed to win allegiance for the character and personality of Jesus, while multitudes treat the Virgin-birth as doubtful, incapable of proof, or irrelevant. To insist on it for the sake of something which stands firm without it, is paralleled by the argument that the miraculous must be maintained, not for itself, but in order to save the autonomy of God.

Yet none of these considerations touches the solid fact that two of the Evangelists preface their narrative with stories the point of which is to set out not only the supernatural character of the Child about to be born, but the supernatural method also of His entrance into this world. These stories are not inventions, pure fancies, with no meaning or history behind them, but on the contrary they contain a truth which we cannot afford to let go, of which popular theology guards the shell, knowing that it contains a kernel indeed, but apparently ignorant as to what the kernel is like.

The difficulties that cluster round this popular belief are not likely to be removed by purely biological considerations, for though these by themselves would only serve to show that parthenogenesis is a power that man long ago dropped (as he has lost the power of renewing lost limbs, still possessed, for example, by the crustaceans), and is not likely to resume even exceptionally, yet to

approach the subject from this end is to approach it from the wrong end. It demands approach from the upper end, from the inner world where is the *process*, rather than from the outer where the *event* is displayed. If we can find that in this higher world there is a process which is aptly symbolised by the Virgin-birth, then we shall be the more disposed to find it credible that in the world of phenomena this process may have its analogue. It is true that this method of approach may as well yield us a symbol as a physical event of the natural order. But have we sufficiently informed ourselves of the awful character of a symbol, or learned that a symbol contains at least as much Reality as an event of the physical plane? or understood what St. Augustine meant when he wrote: "That which is divine is the thing signified and not the sign"? [1]

When God desires to communicate some truth to a prepared soul He explores the depths of its mind where all sorts of intellectual treasures lie hid ready to be called into use by the Imagination touched by the Divine Spirit, and out of these treasures He constructs something which we can describe only as a vision which is not seen, a message which is not heard, as a symbol by means of which the desired truth slips into the mind, and unites in consciousness God and the Soul. Such "symbols have no efficiency unless they are *given* to the mind from within and for it alone. The symbols which are crystallised in the state of narrative or painting can only live again in other consciousnesses

[1] *De Trin.* lib. iii. 19. Cf. also his *De Magistro*, ch. ix. § 25, Bened. ed. i. 555: "Iam ergo intelligas volo res quae significantur pluris quam signa esse pendendas."

by reproduction of the mystic fact which originated them." [1]

Father Poulain [2] has an excellent passage on this head: "In visions of Paradise, Purgatory, or Hell, God only shows in part that reality which is so far beyond our powers of understanding. He adapts Himself to our nature by making use of Symbols. The saints and angels show themselves to us with bodies which they do not in reality possess; they are clothed in rich garments, and take part in processions or ceremonies. Heaven becomes a banquet or an exquisite garden. These pictures appear in accordance with the idea of the person who sees them, or those of the painters of his day. We have an example of this in St. Lidwine's vision, and in that of the Apocalypse of the four living creatures round about the Throne. St. John borrowed its chief features from Ezekiel, who himself took the imagery from the gigantic bas-reliefs of the Assyrian palaces which the Jews had ever before their eyes during the Babylonian captivity."

This same truth of the higher origin of the symbol, and therefore of its greater reality and efficacy, meets us in Art. Every true work of Art is produced in an ecstasy [3] in which the artist is compelled by an inner Power greater than himself. Dante did not sit down and deliberately concoct the *Divina Commedia* out of his own self-conscious mind, but he saw with his immortal eye, and part of what he saw he wrote down. His own energetic

[1] Récéjac, *Bases of the Mystic Knowledge*, p. 143.

[2] *The Graces of Interior Prayer*, p. 329.

[3] This is the burden of that suggestive little book of Mr. Machen's called *Hieroglyphics*.

and well-stored mind contributed, no doubt, the materials for his imagery, but the Life which poured through them was from above. The poet, like Browning's thrush, sings with a fine, careless rapture, and if he knows not rapture what he sings is not music. The Peerless Maid was one of the greatest among the disciples of the Christ because of her exalted and whole-hearted surrender to her heavenly voices. Indeed, all truly great work comes to us from men who have put their Self outside of them, and so given admission to a Power above which waits till self-consciousness is over-passed before It can use them for greater works. Whenever it does this it creates the suitable Symbol as the sign and instrument of its working.

This profound truth of the place of symbols in the higher life lies at the back of the sacramental teaching of the Church of Christ, by which there are excluded at once all worship of the mechanism of the world and all contentment with formalism, historical or otherwise. To the opened eye everything which stimulates sensation in being what it is, is also something more. Hence its capacity for causing in us feelings of awe, reverence, aspiration, self-contempt or religious exaltation. "Alles Vergängliche ist nur ein Gleichnis."

The Virgin-birth then, if it is to take rank as a religious fact, must be raised to the peerage of Symbols. As a physical fact it has no connection with Religion until the physical in it has been used by the Spirit of God as the material by means of which a spiritual truth is revealed to the inner eye of a Seer. That Mary was such a Seer is at least probable, and we might be content to believe that

such a symbol was hers in the order of the physical were it not for the assertion of Jesus in Matt. xii. 50, Mark iii. 35, Luke viii. 21, that the spiritual relation of Master and disciple is closer than that of mother and son, and for the significant silence on the point of the whole of the N.T. outside the Gospel of the Infancy. And yet the Virgin-birth might well be a God-given symbol of the first importance for Religion, and in special for the Christian Religion. To see how this may be, let us just glance at its analogues in the ethnic religions as they appeared at the beginning of our era. Let us turn first to the Gnostics.

The Christ-Mystery, says Hippolytus, "is the gate of heaven, and the house of God, where the good God dwells alone; into which house no impure man shall come, but it is kept under watch for the spiritual alone, and when they arrive thither they must cast away their garments, made sexless through the virginal spirit. For this is the Virgin big with child who conceives and bears a son (not psychical, not fleshly, but a blessed aeon of aeons)." [1]

"The words virgin, virginity, ever-virginal, occur on every other page of Philo. It is indeed Philo who first formulated the idea of the Word, or ideal-ordering principle of the Cosmos being born of an ever-virgin soul, which conceives, because God the Father sows into her His intelligible rays and divine seed, so begetting His only well-beloved Son, the Cosmos." [2]

In Alexandria was celebrated on January 5 a feast of the Aeon identified by Epiphanius with the feast of the Koreion: "If they are asked the

[1] *Ref.* v. 3 *sub finem.*

[2] F. A. Conybeare, *Philo on the Contemplative Life*, pp. 302-3.

meaning of this mystery, they answer and say: 'To-day at this hour the Maiden (Kore), that is, the Virgin, has given birth to the Aeon.'" [1]

In the *Corpus Hermeticum*, xiii. (xiv.) Hermes says that the matter and the womb from out of which Man is born is Wisdom-that-understands in silence, and the seed is the true Good, and the sower is the Will of God. "Whene'er I see in myself," he goes on to say, "the simple vision brought to birth out of God's mercy, I have passed through myself into a body that can never die. And now I am not what I was before, but I am born in mind."

In the Apocalypse of John the heavenly Virgin appears as clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars (xii. 1). Here, says Gunkel, we have an original Babylonian myth which has been worked over by Jewish and Christian authors, and sets out the birth of Marduk, the young sun-god, from Mamkina; and Tiâmat is the dragon who seeks to devour the child.[2]

So in astronomy (as may be seen by drawing a "prime vertical" of the zodiacal heavens at our winter solstice) the sun at Christmas, at midnight, is in the nadir, and has recently entered Capricorn, the sign under Saturn the lord of Time, while at the zenith is Cancer the sign of the Moon or earth-life; the sign Virgo has completely risen above the eastern horizon, and the sign Libra is rising in the east, followed by Scorpio, "the devil-sign." The

[1] Epiph. (*Against Haer.* li. 22, ed. Dind. vol. ii. p. 483); he adds a statement that in Petra, the metropolis of Arabia, the same rites are celebrated, that they hymn the Virgin, calling her "Virgin" and her Son "the only-begotten of the Lord."

[2] *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 385-391.

beginnings of the four cardinal signs are seen to occupy the four quarters of space, forming a great cross. At this winter solstice, the sun, having reached its greatest southern declination, appears to "turn," and proceeds on its northward passage of six months; as it does so, the length of the "day" increases steadily from its minimum in our northern hemisphere till the maximum is reached at the summer solstice. These six months are typified in the "prime vertical" figure by the movement of the earth on its axis during the first twelve hours at Christmas, from midnight to noon, whereby the place occupied by the Sun at midnight appears to be carried up through the eastern horizon till the zenith is reached, and what at midnight was in the zenith is carried down to the nadir. The picture is of Divine life increasing and earth-life decreasing proportionately, till at the summer solstice the Divine life is at the zenith and the earth-life at the nadir. In other words, as Jesus the sun of righteousness rises, the star of John the Baptist, His forerunner, sets (John iii. 30).[1] But at Christmas the sun, who is, as it were, being born again, may be said to be born of Virgo who is then in the East.

Another line of explanation, and on a lower level, has been followed by those who have seen in the miraculous birth of the Saviour but another example of the many similar stories told of great men of all countries who have captivated the imagination of men. Thus the Buddha was said to have been an incarnation of Vishnu through Maya. Plato was a son of Apollo; Augustus also.

Alexander the Great made a great point of his

[1] I owe this astronomical note to my friend, Mr. J. S. Brown.

having been declared in the temple of Jupiter Ammon to be a son of Zeus, and he accordingly disavowed Philip as his father, and the people of Egypt believed him. Their minds were, therefore, predisposed for such a heavenly birth.[1] A similar story is told of Scipio Africanus.[2] That the Hellenistic world was pervaded by a belief in the birth of great men from gods may be seen in the remarks of Justin Martyr in his *First Apology*, that addressed to the Emperor Hadrian, the Emperor responsible for the deification of Antinous. He says: "The Son of God, called Jesus, even if only a man by ordinary generation, yet on account of His wisdom is worthy to be called the Son of God; for all writers call God the Father of men and gods. And if we assert that the Word of God was born of God in a peculiar manner, different from ordinary generation, let this be no extraordinary thing to you who say that Mercury is the angelic word of God. . . . And if we affirm that He was born of a virgin accept this in common with what you accept of Perseus."[3]

But so far from the widespread character of these stories being an evidence that all of them are false, it is rather a proof that all of them are true. Only the world in which the truth is to be found may not be that which the man of naïve consciousness holds to be alone true, or at all events believes to be the touchstone of truth elsewhere. For if

[1] That this story is part of the Romance of Alexander makes no difference to our estimate of the popular thought of the time.

[2] Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Att.* vi. 1.

[3] Chapter xxii. It is interesting to be told that in "the Abyssinian Church to-day there is a theological school which teaches a threefold birth of Christ, from the Father in eternity, from the virgin, and from the Holy Ghost at the baptism" (Harnack, *History of Dogma*, iii. 65).

these stories be "myths," then they are, as the product of the deep and simple folk-mind, myths that proceed out of the Great Spirit of Nature herself. They are not hallucinations (defined as purely internal images possessing the vividness of those that come through the senses and so confused with our sensations) or inventions, but the tribute paid by the unspoilt mind of the child in us to the immediate origin from heaven of all great and demonic personalities.

Yet this method of explanation, borrowed as it is from the science of comparative religion, and, therefore, from learning, does not possess an arm long enough to reach the serene heights of the Gospel-story. For the contrast so often drawn between the directness and simplicity of the Canonical Gospels and the Apocryphal Gospels may be as truly established between the Gospel-story of the miraculous Birth and the similar stories current in ethnic religions. And this for the simple and admitted reason that a great gulf is fixed between the Life which gives birth to Christianity and the more partial manifestations of it elsewhere. What in others was a guess, or a fore-gleam, was in Christianity true. Tertullian was not so far wrong, after all, in regarding the rites and doings of other religions as imitations of those of Christianity; only their teacher was not the Devil but the Spirit who was at work on the *Praeparatio Evangelica.*

Hence the Christian apologist must not seek in history or in learning the interpretation of the Virgin-birth but in the Christian religion itself; that is, in the inner realm of Reality of which the world of sensation is the outside. It is not for nothing indeed that gnostic thought, Babylonian

cosmogony, and Egyptian and Greek theology emphasise the greatness of the Virgin-mother and her child, and that the signs of the Zodiac, the great Bible in the Heavens, testify side by side with Matthew and Luke to the divine origin of Jesus, and to the dignity of His Mother.

For, in the first place, we are dealing here with an event which is the prototype of many repeated events in the experience of Christian men and women in every generation. The fact of conversion or regeneration is as certain, and as frequently attested, as any other event in the history of religious experience, although at the same time it runs more quickly up into a mystery than others. Moreover since Christianity has always insisted through its recognised spokesmen that its power lies in the presence in its heart of the eternal and living and active Spirit, and not in the belief of man in what has been, so the weight of its appeal for acceptance by men must lie in the constant repetition in human life of the typical events of the Gospel-story.[1]

Just as the one valid argument for Christianity is in the last resort the supernatural lives of Christians, so the proof of the truth of its articles and dogmas must be sought in the religious experience of ordinary living Christians. Unless the Virgin-birth, that is to say, is capable of constant reproduc-

[1] To repeat Scheffler's words :

"Though Christ a thousand times in Bethlehem be born,
If He's not born in thee, thy soul is all forlorn ;
The Cross on Golgotha will never save thy soul ;
The Cross in thine own heart alone can make thee whole.

"Christ rose not from the dead, Christ is still in the grave,
If thou for whom He died art still of sin the slave,
Hold there ! Where runnest thou ? Know Heaven is in thee ;
Seek'st thou for God elsewhere, His face thou'lt never see."

tion it may indeed vindicate its place in history, but it ceases to be a religious fact.

But in what sense is it possible to maintain that "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary" can be predicated of others beside Jesus Christ Himself? And if it can, can we escape from the charge of taking words in a "non-natural sense," of using them in one sense of Jesus and in another sense when applied to others? Probably no one can expect to escape from obloquy who tries to set out truths which are beyond the range of *l'homme moyen sensuel*, but in the case before us the charge would have no justification. For as we have tried to show in an earlier place (p. 9) the assertion that a truth holds, say, in the psychical order, is no barrier to its repeating itself also in the physical. Hence, if it can be shown that the Virgin-birth is true in the higher realm it does not follow that it is false in the lower realm. But with this lower realm of physics religion has only an indirect concern, for it belongs to one of its partners, Science. Its concern is with the relation of the Soul of God.

Now it is strictly here where the great truth of the Article before us is exemplified in Jesus Christ and in His disciples, in Him pre-eminently and in them according to their capacity. "Conceived by the Holy Ghost" is one way of saying that he who is in the kingdom of heaven has been born from above;[1] he has been born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God,[2] that is, by a birth which is not physical, nor psychical, nor of the higher Reason, but by the

[1] John iii. 3.

[2] John i. 13. Cf. Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, p. 290 n.

impartation by God of His own life. Hence Jesus insisted repeatedly to His disciples that God was their Father, as God was His Father; they were sons of God as He was the Son of God, because alike they were conceived by the Holy Ghost.

McGiffert[1] has drawn attention to the, at first glance, somewhat strange fact that the Baptism of Jesus does not appear as an Article of the Creed. But this difficulty disappears if we place our present Article on its proper base. For the Article itself then says, what the glory of the Baptism can only repeat more emphatically, viz. that Jesus Christ was a Being who rose above all the categories of ordinary thought, and could be described only as one who belonged primarily to the heavenly order and only secondarily to the earthly. At the same time, the Article does not set out to do much more than a Catholic anathema sets out to do,[2] viz. not so much assert what is true as rule out what is false. The heavenly, whether in Jesus Himself or one of His followers, is not defined for thought, but is declared to be not definable by any expedient of Reason, only to be outlined, or hinted at (for those who may have ears to hear), by analogies drawn from the lower sphere.

"Born of the Virgin Mary." The dweller in the kingdom must be born of water as well as of the Spirit;[3] not of Spirit alone, nor of soul alone,

[1] *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 120.

[2] Cf. *e.g.* in Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, 5th ed., 1874, p. 345, the Encyclical of Pius IX. *Quanta cura* ends thus: "Itaque omnes et singulas pravas opiniones ac doctrinas singillatim hisce literis commemoratas auctoritate Nostra Apostolica reprobamus, proscribimus atque damnamus, easque ab omnibus catholicae Ecclesiae filiis, veluti reprobatas, proscriptas atque damnatas omnino haberi volumus et mandamus." A shorter form is used in *Canones*, as *e.g.* in the third of the Vatican Council of 1870: "Si quis dixerit unam eandemque esse Dei et rerum omnium substantiam vel essentiam: anathema sit."

[3] John iii. 5.

for Spirit is the Life, soul supplies the form and body, and under this present dispensation all things are double one against another,[1] and the end will come only when the man is as the woman and the woman as the man, neither male nor female.[2] The law of duality expressed here is the Law into which all the laws we know run back; its sphere is the phenomenal universe, and in that universe it is the ultimate law, for the law by which we are compelled to seek for Unity belongs to the inner world which lies behind the outer. The supreme example of this law of Duality is to be found in the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, though of course every birth into this world exemplifies it.

In the mystical language of antiquity the spirit is represented by fire, the sun, or gold, the soul by water, the moon, or silver, and the mention of these emblematic terms would in those times have called up the reality signified as inevitably as to us it calls up the image of the material thing only. It is just this difference of horizon which makes it difficult for the scientific and materialistic West to interpret the documents of the philosophic and spiritually-minded East. Where we are reminded of a physical birth, or of baptism in material water, the Eastern mind collects from the same phraseology images of a birth into a higher spiritual order, or of a "soul-substance" or soul-powers which act as a "form" when the Holy Ghost descends to give life. What is contended for here is that this higher sense of the Article before us is the original sense, and that the Western interpretation in terms

[1] Ecclus. xlii. 24.

[2] A logion of Jesus quoted in Pseudo-Clement, § 12, *Pat. Ap. Opera*, ed. Gebhardt and Harnack, 1902, p. 40.

of physical life is—whatever the historical truth of it—partly a concession to the hard sensualism of the West, and partly an unconscious surrender to it. Nor is it any valid objection to this contention to say that the facts of the fourth and even the third century reveal no trace of the prevalence of this alleged earlier conception, for it is not pretended that the "Peace of the Church" in A.D. 313 sprang into birth *uno ictu*, like Pallas Athene, but was the result of a process of approximation between the Church and the World which began even in Apostolic times, and is witnessed to by such passages in the N.T. as emphasise the need for discipline,[1] and show us that the Brotherhood is beginning to pass into a legalistic society, by the *Didache*, by the writings of Irenaeus and Tertullian.

Fortunately, neither has the Church Catholic ever insisted on an interpretation of this Article which is solely or even chiefly physical, nor has the Church of England yielded to the temptation to narrow what the Church universal has left open. In fact her history for three centuries has been distinguished by an increasing desire to expand towards truth from whatever quarter it come, to listen to the voice of Reason, to ignore noisy fanaticism, and to encourage Religion under every form, demanding only the proofs of life.

But we must not fail to do justice to the stern demand made on the reciter of the Creed by the word *Virgin*. The end of the Christian religion is to train souls for God, and its beginning is in being born of God. But no one can be born from above who does not come with a virgin-soul, virgin in the sense of being pure from all self-seeking, at least

[1] 1 Cor. v. 3, vi. 4; Tit. iii. 10; 1 John iii. 10.

in desire, and not in the sense of never having tasted of the forbidden fruit. In the Paradise of God is place as well for the violet of penitence as for the lily of innocence; or shall we say that the lily of earth must pass into the violet of suffering before it can be transmuted into the lily of heaven? It is not ignorance of evil which fits for heaven, but the knowledge of it and power over it, born of resistance and ending in hatred of it. Where that hatred has become a fixed habit, or even so much of a habit as God can accept as the germ,[1] there is the Virgin-soul ready for the quickening power of the Spirit, in order that out of the union of the two the Christ may be born as the hope of the glory that is to be.[2] The beatitude, "Blessed are the pure in heart,"[3] is for those childlike hearts which have shed the glamour of self-consciousness, self-seeking, and self-complacency, and are ready to hearken when God speaks, and to do whatever God orders. This may consist, and often does consist with the presence of many weeds in the soul's garden, but it is this single-pointed character of the soul which marks the candidate for the higher life. Dr. Johnson with his sound common-sense had this truth in mind when he said of a carelessly-living man that he was a good man, seeing that he always took off his hat on passing a Church.

The universe then is of one piece, where the macrocosm is reflected in the microcosm, or *vice versa*; hence the signs of the Zodiac are also in the structure of man, and he has his heavenly mother, his sun-god, and his dragon. The dragon of the deep is the power of Matter, or of separated

[1] Rom. iv. 17. [2] Col. i. 27. [3] Matt. v. 8.

selfhood which seeks to devour the divinity latent in man. When the Soul, figured as Eve, listens to the seductions of sense, *i.e.* of Life as seeking to act apart from the Whole, she becomes from generate degenerate and must become regenerate, *i.e.* she must become purified, or single-pointed, and then perfect her purification by giving birth to the Christ through the Spirit who is her true husband. Eve must become Mary, and her Son the St. George bruising the serpent's head. The Soul is first the daughter, then the spouse, and finally the Mother of God.

But since the roots of all the Ideas or Forces or Principles or Persons of the phenomenal order have their roots in the Divine Being from whom they proceed, this same law of Duality, so far from being arbitrary, will appear as the necessary expression in Space and Time of that Unity which is beyond and behind both. God the Father manifests as Father-Mother, as Life-Substance, where the Power which manifests as the substance of all things is in things above styled the Heavenly Mother and in things below the Blessed Virgin Mary. "In the Unmanifest She is the Great Deep, or Ocean of Infinitude, the Principium or Arche, the heavenly Sophia, or Wisdom, Who encircles and embraces all things; of Whom are dimension and form and appearance; whose veil is the astral fluid, and Who is Herself the substance of all souls." [1]

[1] A. Kingsford, *The Perfect Way*, Lect. II. p. 34. In the Fourth Gospel the Prologue contains manifest references to Gnostic speculations in the terms it uses, such as Beginning, Word, Light, Life, Darkness, Fulness, Man, Monogenes. Its object appears to be to simplify this doctrine of aeons by "recapitulating" them in the "only-begotten Son." In this case it is noticeable that the Ἀρχή or *Principium* (St. Augustine treats the term as personal) is linked with Λόγος as Νοῦς with Σοφία, the Heavenly Mother. The Λόγος or Heavenly Son is in the Σοφία or Heavenly Mother, while Θεός the Father as the Πηγὴ θειότητος is the ground of all.

Hence when we come to interpret the article "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary," there lies behind us that vast mass of secular tradition which comes down from the oldest age and meets us to-day alike in Catholic ritual and in Goethe's *Faust.* The Heavenly Mother, the Divine Wisdom, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the *Ewig-weibliche* are synonymous.

If there is any solid ground in Reality for this interpretation, the thoughtful mind will view the relegation of the symbol of the Mother and Child to obscurity or contumely as a blunder of the first magnitude on the part of the Protestant world. The fact that Egypt and Babylon had the grace to exalt the symbol in pre-Christian days is with all unprejudiced persons an argument in favour of its continuance. The further fact that the symbol has been abused (if indeed it has) in the mediaeval and in the Roman Church of to-day may suggest caution and enjoin a sense of the proportion of things but cannot be used as a valid argument for disuse. In all probability the spirit which began by spitting on the Divine Mother and Child is the same which has since proceeded to de-sanctify the home, to degrade womanhood, to worship force, to justify prostitution, to seek for wealth and ensue it, and in general to substitute materialism for Life and Purpose, and utilitarianism for Beauty and Goodness.[1]

[1] One result which might be fairly looked for from a wise use of the symbol of the Mother and Child would be the abolition of the common but wholly wrong habit of thought, which treats as unholy all that pertains to parenthood. This disaster might have been avoided if the article "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary" had been seen to emphasise among other things the celestial law which underlies the ordinary process of conception and birth. Indeed we may say of ordinary birth even that in every case the true parent is a divine Spirit, a Power of the Highest God, and that the earthly father is merely a mode of working

If the Mother and Child be the supreme symbol of religion; if the symbol is bound up with worship—worship in spirit and in truth—of the Great Reality which is as truly the eternal Mother as the eternal Father, then the result in ultimates of its rejection will be coarseness, pushfulness, egoism, lawlessness, and social heedlessness and cruelty. The world is of one piece, and falseness anywhere mars the whole, the falseness in the soul issues in foulness in the body.

The worship of the eternal Beauty may be recommended from our pulpits and illustrated by our choirs, but until it is assigned its equal right with ethic and thought in deed as well as in word, that is, until we practical and calculating Anglo-Saxons eschew our traditional timidity where Beauty is concerned, and worship it and not merely use it as an adjunct in our Churches, not till then shall we begin to lead our fellows to live by admiration, hope, and love. In every Church the Mother and the Child, perhaps in the form of the Sistine Madonna, should find a place, not as an "idol," but as a "book of the unlearned," that is, of all of us, in which we may see reflected something of the Divine Love and Beauty which are implicit in the formula, "conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary."

---

of this unseen Power. How much more true is this when the "child" that is being conceived is a holy thing, a Son of God, and how sacred a thing would earthly parenthood be seen to be if it were realised that a divine Spirit overshadows those who are becoming parents, and acts as the Lord and the Giver of Life! This awful truth is if anything made still more awful by observing that in the Gospel-story the conception takes place at the moment of self-surrender when the soul yields itself with the words, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord." It is as if all that had gone before was but the wooing of His Bride by the divine Bridegroom, and as if the wooing became effective only by the yielding of the human will to the divine.

CHAPTER IX

THE FOURTH ARTICLE

Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried

Τὸν παθόντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, σταυρωθέντα, ἀποθανόντα καὶ ταφέντα

Suffered

MANKIND is subject to a double law which compels it while maintaining the authority of what it knows of the Good, the Beautiful, and the True, to press forward at the same time to the pursuit of what is more good, more beautiful, and more true, and the price it pays for necessary obedience to both laws is *Suffering*. For, in the first place, experience has convinced us that no treasure we have in keeping can remain ours for long unless we are prepared to do violence to our constitutional love of ease, to our mental and moral *vis inertiae*, and expend as much energy in preserving our good as went to the winning. A fortune won by one man's energy tends to be dispersed by the third descendant through ignorance of the conditions under which it can be held. Similarly, the same *vis inertiae* acts perpetually to make us content with what we already hold, no matter how we may have gained it, and to prevent us from putting forth energy to

make our possession richer and fuller. The resistance that Life as a progressive force makes to this stubborn conservatism of things is the proximate cause of Suffering.

Suffering is the feeling of displeasure which arises when Life feels itself thwarted in its onward march, that is, whenever consciousness is obstructed or disabled in its faculty of paying attention. Monotony, on the other hand, such a multiplicity as causes distraction, simplicity without variety, or complexity without unity, disorder when we expected order, movement when we looked for rest, defeat or disappointment, morbid sensitiveness to external things, the enslaving effect of heredity or environment, all are examples of the displeasure which comes when "effective attention . . . fails of exercise owing to the narrowness of the field of consciousness and the slowness and smallness of its changes." [1] These hindrances to attention (if we prefer to exalt Thought) or to Will (if we prefer Will) come from two directions, one within, and one without; from within when we are dimly conscious of desiring more than we have power to grasp; and from without when the course of Nature or of History limits us in the pursuit of what our innermost being impels us to desire and to strive for.

Suffering then may be described as the spontaneous protest of Life against Death, or conversely as the toll exacted by Death from Life, or as the bridge which has to be crossed by the "Love" of Heraclitus before it can overcome his "Discord." In the Article before us the "suffering" of Jesus

[1] Professor James Ward in art. "Psychology" in *Ency. Brit.*, 9th ed., xx. 71; cf. Stout, *Manual of Psychology*, 1899, pp. 276-283.

Christ is defined as coming from outside sources, since it is under Pontius Pilate. Before, however, attempting to show what this Suffering consisted in it seems necessary to indicate briefly the universality of this phenomenon of suffering, for the groaning and travailing in pain of Creation is an anticipatory illustration of the similar pain of the sons of God, and of the Son of God Himself.

(*a*) Even in the *vegetable* world there occurs a phenomenon which is analogous to suffering in the higher kingdoms of Nature. Nowhere else is the competition for a place to live in more acute than here. A garden untended will soon be overgrown with weeds, and the weeds will kill out the more delicate plants that it may be desired to rear, while, on the other hand, if these latter are to grow the former must be ruthlessly exterminated. If you want your hedges to put out a thick and effective undergrowth you must clip their tops regularly, and if your fruit-trees and rose-trees are to bear fruit and blossom they must be severely pruned, and sometimes cut back cruelly. All of this shows that Life is a Force which is constantly seeking expression, and that it can find its higher forms (as we consider them) only by suffering the lower forms to be removed by man as their *Deus ex machina*.

(*b*) In the *animal* world feeling appears as the expression of its higher life, and cries, as in the case of the higher vertebrates, dogs, cats, birds, etc., make themselves heard as the protest of the animal against a violent interference with the course of its natural activities, or violent convulsive movements as with eels, worms, or frogs. The silent anger of the sufferer from toothache, or the fortitude of the

wounded soldier marks the more calm but not less strenuous judgment that the suffering endured is as such a hostile invader.

(*c*) In man's *psychic* life suffering plays a still more considerable part, in spite of the curiously-unnoticed fact that much of it is disguised from the subject under names which seem to transfer it to the moral order, although the very term applied to them, viz. "passions," should be enough to reveal their true character. Thus vanity is a form of suffering arising from the necessity felt by the individual to maintain a sense of his own importance in face of the attacks made on it by the encroaching superiority of others; quarrelsomeness is a form of suffering which consists of Egoism thrown into convulsions by competition for a good which cannot be shared; deceit is a form of suffering undergone by the weaker in order to escape from the despotism of the stronger; vengefulness is a form of suffering which seeks to restore to self-conceit an equilibrium it has lost; and obstinacy is a form of suffering caused by the effort of a man to persuade himself that he is strong. These and similar "passions" belong at bottom to the passive side of the soul; they are endured not willed, and appear as the reaction of the soul to stimuli from without (*e.g.* from other men) which are thought or felt to be hostile to the degree of Life then enjoyed by the sufferer. That Life is prized, and to maintain it the corresponding suffering is undergone.

(*d*) In man's *spiritual* life a still higher grade is reached, and the same law which enjoins Suffering also sharpens it and ennobles it at the same time. For the spiritual man is one whose centre of gravity

has been shifted from the lower and narrower Self to the Higher Self, and, therefore, the Life of which he is the guardian is, as he knows, not his but common to all. Hence his interests are in the larger world, in his family, his country, or even in every one who bears the form of man, and where his interests are there are his pains. His sufferings are inexplicable to those on the lower steeps of life, for they do not centre in his own personality, but in others and even in remote nations. An Armenian massacre, an injustice in Calcutta, atrocities in South America or West Africa, these cause in him a sense of suffering of the most intense and mordant kind because such wickednesses are felt as a stain on the escutcheon of mankind, or a defiance of God, and a denial of that divine Life which the spiritual man finds in himself and had hoped to find everywhere else.

All these rising grades of suffering show that Life automatically pays the price demanded of it whenever anything of its own Truth, Goodness, or Beauty is assailed. It asserts its right to live in its chosen form, and to maintain that living form against all comers. Its suffering is Nature's danger-signal, and the sign of the individual's response to the challenge to meet his foe. Similarly it may be shown that suffering is the toll exacted not only when anything has to maintain its right to the good it has, but when it has to push forward in the quest of a higher good which it has not yet acquired.[1]

In this latter case the Law of Suffering, however, is interlocked with another Law, the Law of

[1] "Joy is the tendency to Unity; Sorrow is the division of the One" (St. Augustine, *De Lib. Arb.* ch. xvi.).

Compensation, of which the rule of asceticism as practised by Oriental hermits and Egyptian monks was a caricature. For the Law of Compensation lays down that while the amount of Life-force that the individual thing can bear to receive and use remains constant within certain limits, it can grow in one direction on the condition only of ceasing to grow in others. Thus, for example, the specialist is great in his own department but at the cost of the loss of a more general culture; physical toil develops muscle, but not brain; ambition is incompatible with a life of passion; breadth and depth of mental life are apt to cancel one another; in short it is not in religion alone that the service of two masters is impossible.

This Law, then, which seems to exact development in sections subserves that greater Law which insists that the progress of a self-purposive being shall be brought about not merely by constant effort on his part to reach the ideal, but also by an equally constant refusal to allow place to isolated impulsive tendencies. In neither case is the result brought about without effort, and the more sustained the effort the higher is its value and the more probable its ultimate success. But since effort implies resistance to the Will and every emotion is disagreeable when the conative tendencies involved in it are thwarted,[1] it follows that pain or suffering is an inevitable accompaniment of all endeavour either to maintain or to secure the True, the Beautiful, and the Good.

The statement, then, in the Creed that Jesus Christ suffered involves the affirmation that His life was a truly human life in that it was marked

[1] Stout, *Manual of Psychology*, p. 298.

by an unceasing struggle for its goal, and for the overcoming of all obstacles in its path. It makes little difference whether this devotion is called the doing of the Father's will,[1] or the being baptized with His proper baptism,[2] or submission,[3] or an ardent desire,[4] or a steady purpose,[5] or an unmoved knowledge of the end,[6] or an eye on the prize,[7] for what is clearly taken for granted in the N.T. is that the life of Jesus was not a life of calm, going steadily to its destined end with stoic *apathy* or Oriental fatalism, but was a real, sincere, genuine human life filled with the same experience of struggle and suffering as the lives of other men are, which could mourn for others' ills,[8] and feel an aversion from suffering.[9] He too learned obedience by the things which He suffered.[10]

His suffering then cannot be properly appraised if we sever it from His human struggle to maintain in unbroken continuity the harmony of the two Wills in Him, or in other words to resist all "temptations," which, if not resisted, would make a breach between them. The nature of these temptations may be illustrated by two passages in the story of His life, His "temptations in the wilderness," [11] and His own description of them.[12]

A. *The Temptations in the Wilderness.* — The wilderness with its forty days is a familiar Biblical image for this our mortal life of trial and struggle, the purpose of which is to bring the elements of our lower soul-nature (figured by the number *four*) into obedience to the law of God (figured by the

[1] John iv. 34. [2] Luke xii. 50. [3] Mark xiv. 36.
[4] Luke xxii. 15. [5] Luke ix. 51. [6] Matt. xx. 18.
[7] Heb. xii. 2. [8] Matt. xxiii. 37. [9] Luke xxii. 42, Mark xv. 34.
[10] Heb. v. 8. [11] Matt. iv. 1-11. [12] Luke xviii. 31-34.

number *ten*).[1] This process has to be brought about in the wilderness, that is, in a state of the soul which is a wilderness through want of cultivation, where the plough of trial and suffering has not broken up the fallow-ground,[2] where the seed of Divine life is, but is dormant until wakened by the shock from without. Hence the three "temptations in the wilderness" are not to be restricted to one time or one place, but are typical of the tests, or trials, which came throughout the life down to the end.[3] A very cursory consideration of them should suffice to show their typical character.

(*a*) Every initiation into Life is preceded by tests, and the tests fall under three heads, corresponding to the threefold division of man's nature into body, soul, and spirit, where all three are good because coming from God. The test is not to see whether the Ego will yield to the allurements of sense, but whether it will elect to order its lower will by the higher will. Not sensuality, not pride is the root of sin, but self-will. Hence the "first

[1] The significance of the numbers given in the Bible has not been sufficiently observed, and when it has it has been too often carried to absurd extremes, but it may be pointed out briefly that ordinarily *one* stands for the Divine Nature as Unmanifest; *two* as Manifest; *three* is God as both; *four* is the signature of the material world; *five* is the sign of Man's soul struggling with Matter; *six* is the number of equilibrium or of the cessation of activity; *seven* (3 + 4) is man's lower self in perfect harmony with spirit; *eight* is the number of a fresh beginning and therefore of regeneration; *nine* (rarely used) is the number which falls short of ten; *ten* is the number of perfect obedience; *eleven* of disobedience; and *twelve* of the full, harmonious total of the inner powers of Man. That this interpretation is not fanciful may be seen from the example of St. Augustine and St. Gregory in their interpretation of John xxi. 11, where 153 as the sum of the first seventeen natural numbers is explained to be the number of those who in the power of the sevenfold Spirit keep the ten commandments of God. We must also remember that the O.T. was finally edited and the N.T. took its rise in a period when Kabbalism and kindred modes of thought were prevalent.

[2] Jer. iv. 3.

[3] Luke xxii. 28.

temptation in the wilderness" takes the form of a suggestion that the "end" for which the Christ-soul is sent here might be attained by the use of personal capacities, *i.e.* of real but lower powers. To turn stones into bread is to raise up sons to God out of the stony hearts of men,[1] not by the power of God but independently of God, by means of powers lodged in the individual. In Matt. iii. 9 it is God who can raise up children, as in 1 Cor. xv. 38 it is God who gives the seed its body, and so here Jesus replies that it is by God's creative power that men live. He refuses to allow that eloquence, learning, political power, social influence, or historic prestige, or other powers than those flowing out directly from God are fit weapons for helping towards the raising up sons of God.[2] The Great Work which all ages have been dumbly crying out for, and ours not least, can only be done in the power of obedience and loyalty to the living God.

(*b*) But if success is not to be sought for along the road of the dexterous use of natural powers, may it not be achieved by the use of Magic? May not a man separate himself from the crowd, live on a pinnacle of the temple, master the creatures of the four elements, develop astral, demonic, Atlantidean powers of terrific intensity, defy the "Dweller on the Threshold," and compel even angels to do

[1] Cf. Matt. iii. 9.

[2] Is not this a word for "Socialists" as well as others? The better sort of "Socialist" hopes that the kingdom of God will be established, or at least hastened, by an improvement in our methods of the production and distribution of wealth, especially if the community as a whole regulates these processes. But they forget that unless human nature be changed for the better at the same time, the same kind of men will show the same kind of selfishness under the new conditions, and will therefore change the form of social evils, but not their character. What is wanted is better men, not better laws, and to get better men God must be called in.

his bidding? Would not such a man be able to take a short cut to beneficent rule, and compel the masses to a better life by dazzling them with a display of his superhuman powers?

Science may not have yet found the secret of such powers, but science is not in a position to deny their existence, or the possibility of their attainment, nor can we dismiss all legends which tell of them as products of pure fancy or love of the marvellous. The reply, too, of Jesus does not affirm or deny their contingency, but says that admitting their existence they are not lawful in the sense suggested. The person who labours to acquire such powers in his solitary watch-tower, or to use them at his own discretion, is running a fearful risk in tempting the Lord his God, committing the one sin which the Lord's Prayer directs itself against, the sin of Massah and Meribah, the sin of usurping the sovereignty of God in deciding without Him to act as His vicegerent.

The bane of minds which pursue Power apart from Ethic consists in an extravagant adulation of a fancied greatness in things, and in the absence of a sense of proportion of worth in common things. Cut off from patient and reverent study of the Actual they invest the world around them with imaginary potentialities, and long for the acquisition of powers which they are too impatient or too lazy to acquire by the patient study of Nature in detail. Hence comes the attraction of such offers as a Mephistopheles offers a Faust, and a Satan to Jesus. Instead of going to school with Dame Nature to learn her truths they bid us to impose our guesses and desires on her, and so compel her to our will. This critical difference of aim and

method is what underlies alike the suggestion to leap down from the pinnacle of the Temple; the legends in the *Tol'doth Jesu* of the conflicts in the air between Jesus and Judas; [1] the similar conflicts between Peter and Simon Magus, and the stories of the Witches' Sabbaths of the Middle Age. The impatience, or pride, or self-will involved in these is what Jesus in His lifetime suffered as a temptation, and decisively rejected on the ground of the duty of obeying, not tempting God.

(*c*) A still more subtle form of temptation then came to effect what the others had failed in doing. The spiritual life has as its property the power of rising to the inner Mount of Contemplation whence can be seen in an ineffable way all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them in a moment of time. Few men but can look back to moments of insight and detachment when the secret heart of things seemed to be disclosed, the worth of them all revealed as in a flash, and the possession of them half-promised. The soul seemed then shivering on the brink of a new and higher kind of energy and happiness, and it felt like the Three on the Mount that it was good to be there, and it desired to make for itself a tabernacle so as to retain for a time its bliss. The poet, the seer, the prophet, the reformer, the devotee, the saint can testify to this experience, and some of them have also testified to the subtle temptation which accompanies this mystic experience to utilise it as material for the feeding of the Lower-self, to turn into a more

[1] This is an imitation of the legend of a conflict in the air between Simon Magus and Peter, and of another between Moses and Bileam. The belief in Magic underlies all three stories. See Krauss, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen*, 1902, p. 175.

refined enjoyment what was sent as an invitation to go up higher.

From this to trusting to be able to control the higher social forces is a short and easy step. The seer whose heart is not pure may easily persuade himself that the exceptional grace accorded him is proof of his security, and may proceed to commit himself for gaining his life's end to the use of such powers as his character, reputation, influence, position, or wealth puts within his reach. To trust to these, however, instead of looking to God to direct him is to trust to the power of the form-world of which "Satan" is the Lord. The rejection of the temptation is secured by the restoration of the principle that man's duty is to worship not the Lord of Form, but the Lord of Life and to commit himself to His hands for service.

These three forms of recurring temptations, recurring in hydra-headed forms during His earthly life, called for constant watchfulness and prayer,[1] for striving,[2] for vehement effort,[3] for constant communion with God.[4] And all this involved effort and tension, and these in their turn brought with them suffering.

These typical sufferings, however, are dealt with in the narrative from their inner side rather than their outer, as the generalised essential content of an indefinite number of external attacks. In another passage we are given another picture of the Lord's sufferings regarded now from the outside, and described by means of the persons who inflicted them, and of the means they used. The passage is Luke xviii. 31-34, and its parallel

[1] Mark xiii. 37.
[2] Luke xiii. 34.
[3] Matt. xi. 12.
[4] Luke vi. 12.

Mark x. 32-34, and it is so remarkable that it deserves something more than a passing notice.

B. The sufferings are those of the "Son of Man," *i.e.* of Him who is the Son of the Heavenly Man, and is commissioned to confer the same title on others, provided that they become friends by oneness of life (John xv. 15).[1] With them He is in the Way, the Way that leadeth to Life, which is the Way of purity, humility, and obedience trodden by all who are given to the Son by the Father,[2] though in each generation they be few who find it.[3] This Way leadeth up to Jerusalem, the City of the Great King, the goal of every pilgrim, the home to which the destined "son of man" is a stranger while he is in exile on earth. But that he is ascending, what is this but that he first descended? The Pilgrim, like his Master, "cometh from afar, and the star that riseth with him, his life's star hath had elsewhere its setting." But no Pilgrim travels securely unless his Master go before the twelve. These Twelve represent the completed personality of every man when he comes to be perfect as his Master, and are the three gates of each of the four sides of the heavenly Jerusalem, the twelve signs of the Zodiac and the twelve tribes of the 144,000 of the redeemed Israel. The Christ goes before to show the Way; the disciple who so far has not brought to harmony his twelvefold being depends on Him for guidance and protection.

The Son of Man undergoes all the sufferings and trials which are necessary for perfecting His humanity. This Initiation of the human into the

[1] Cf. my paper on the *Son of Man* (Headley Brothers).
[2] John vi. 37. [3] Matt. vii. 14.

mysteries of Divine life is the goal set before Him—"He shall be fully initiated" = τελεσθήσεται.[1] In the early hylic days, long, long before any ideal was seen or effectively known by rudimentary man, he learned the value of earth's lower goods by taking them and enjoying them to the full. Then he was taught by experience that lower pleasures do not satisfy, and that he must discriminate as to the kind, and be prudent as to the quantity of pleasure he snatched. Next there was slowly developed out of this self-control joined to the pressure of social life a sense that each pleasure offered itself not for acceptance, but as an instrument of testing. Out of this recognition sprang with untold struggle and suffering the Will to push forward to the goal, to deny the lower Self, and to embrace cheerfully the sufferings through which we enter into life. So the Pilgrim is born, so he suffers, and so he reaches the haven where he would be.

He has one source of assistance if only he knows it. The whole course has been mapped out for him by the "prophets," *i.e.* by the goodly company of men who have seen the truth of Life and have spoken of it to others, not only Bible prophets, but men of all peoples and languages, men like Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, Pythagoras, Plato, Aeschylus, Dante, Kant, Goethe, Carlyle, Ruskin, and Browning. All in varying degrees of insight and faithfulness do but repeat the teaching of the Master of them all that to attain the life that is life indeed we must be content to surrender the life which is its shadow, its ἀντίμιμον πνεῦμα.

The Man of God is next said to be "handed

[1] Luke xviii. 31.

over "[1] to the chief priests and scribes first, and by them to the Gentiles. The meaning of this procedure will be best discussed under the heading of "Pontius Pilate," and it is enough here to say that this declaration will be treated by one or other kind of rationalist as either an intelligent anticipation, or a prophecy after the event, but by the mystic as the definition of the standing attitude towards him of ecclesiastical and civil authority wherever freedom does not exist.

The weapons of authority are ridicule ("he shall be mocked"), insult ("spitefully entreated"), rejection with loathing ("spitted on"), torture ("scourged"), and finally the putting to death. Ridicule is the first form of opposition by conservatism to what is new, and as "a slight revolt on the surface of social life" it may have its uses, but as often as not it is on a larger scale the kind of criticism to which the sage is subjected by immature and raw youths, or the answer of ignorance to wisdom. Insult is always the expression of a vulgar mind when irritated by the superiority of God's aristocrat. Loathing of that which is holy is equally distinctive of the coarse mind when confronted with the Ideal it hates. And torture, whether physical or psychical, is the only resource the materialist has against the Idealist.

This is but a brief sketch of the place of suffering in the higher life. No account has been taken of the class of suffering which seems an excrescence on Nature, or as perhaps inherent in the nature of things, for this is beyond our present scope. It is suffering as consciously accepted, with its origin

[1] It is the same word which is wrongly translated in the story of the Passion as "betrayed."

and meaning recognised, and endured as a means to the clearly descried and chosen end with which the Creed is concerned, the suffering of the Son of Man, and in their degree of all who follow Him.

CHAPTER X

THE FOURTH ARTICLE (*continued*)

Under Pontius Pilate

"It was an improvement on the older form of the Creed to say 'suffered under Pontius Pilate,' and then first to add 'crucified' . . . for Pilate was not the instigator of the Crucifixion."[1] This improvement for the history is also an improvement for its meaning, for just as we are sure to miss the mark if we sever the death from the life, so shall we also if we concentrate the suffering on the crucifixion. If "Mysticism is the tendency to draw near to the Absolute in moral union by symbolic means,"[2] then it is bound to ask what Pontius Pilate stands for in the Creed. Granted that he was a historic figure, a procurator of Judaea on a given date, what moral or spiritual force did he embody when the course of events involved him in the history of Jesus Christ? If he be a type, what is the content of that type which we may recognise in its concrete manifestations down the course of history?

[1] Zahn, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 150; he does not think, however, that it is Docetic polemic which is responsible for the name, but the desire to fix the historic reality. McGiffert draws attention (*Apostles' Creed*, p. 130) to the fact otherwise known that the needs of exorcism as well as of baptism stereotyped this historical reference.

[2] Récéjac, *Bases of the Mystic Knowledge*, p. 64.

It will help us to answer this question if we do not isolate Pilate but consider in connection with him the other characters which play their part in the Story of the Passion. The most important of these are Caiaphas (representing the priests and scribes), Herod, Judas, and Satan.

The last is the figure which calls for treatment first, and is a figure which it is the easier to deal with in thought than it was in the days of Jonathan Edwards. For men have come to see that Mazdaean dualism is unthinkable even in the mediaeval form of God and Devil, and that somehow, unless the ultimate task of Thought is to mock us, such a dualism in any form must be got rid of. Nor does it seem enough to point us to the end of things when the crooked shall be made straight, and to bid us to wait patiently for the " Day," for in the first place the Christ's good news was the coming of the kingdom here and now, and His coming to the soul whether in the body or out of the body is " the day of the Lord " which was to come ; and in the second place the dualism of Good and Evil is a present fact and demands a present explanation, or at all events some rational hypothesis which may help us for a time to do without an explanation.

Such an explanation has been borrowed from the modern hypothesis of Evolution in the form of the suggestion that Evil is but Good in the making, which hardly seems to do justice to the fact of the persistent vitality of Evil and its recurrence on all planes of existence. Or it has been maintained, where Oriental influences have penetrated, that Matter, if not evil in itself, is the cause of Evil as being a drag on its spiritual partner. This explana-

tion, however, is divided by too fine a line from the broad field of Manichaeism to vindicate for itself a separate existence. Or Evil is said to be *Maya*, delusion and ignorance, which declares its form and mode of working but not its lineage or nature. Besides, it is arguable that some degree of ignorance in some circumstances is a boon and a safeguard, that " where ignorance is bliss 'tis folly to be wise." For there is apparently over us a beneficent Law called the Law of Illusion which leads us to a truth while we pursue some shadow as the truth itself. But none of these suggestions supplies what we are in search of, viz. a statement of the relations of Good and Evil in this present world which shall not diminish aught from God's perfection, or do violence to our moral sense.

The following professes to provide us with such a statement, provided, it says, that we do not compel it to go further than it professes to go, or regard it as anything but a provisional solution of what in the last resort is admittedly insoluble.

The world of phenomena is a world in which the Divine Unity, in Itself indivisible, appears as dual for purposes of manifestation. Subject and object; active and passive; here and there; within and without; thought and feeling; male and female; life and form; animate and inanimate; Church and State; finite and infinite; science and art; the individual and the community: these are but a few of the complementary pairs of opposites with which the empirical world is filled. These conjoined opposites are given, and, therefore, it is not open to us to say that either is better or worse, higher or lower than the other, but only that each is different from its partner, and that they are mutu-

ally necessary to one another. That is, that both are worthy, equally worthy, and that the whole is to be obtained only by a union of both.

Such pairs of opposites may be brought under a universal concept if they be regarded for the moment as special cases of the polaric law of Attraction and Repulsion—the law formulated by Heraclitus as that of Love and Discord.[1] An excellent illustration of this may be seen in the law which keeps the planets in their orbits, describing what is practically an ellipse round the sun. The two foci of this ellipse are constituted by the bright centre which is the sun himself and a dark centre without a local habitation, which none the less is as important to the constancy of the whole planetary movement as the sun himself. The sun represents the attractive power, and the dark centre the repulsive power; the one power if it acted alone would destroy the planet's separate existence, and the other would send it to an eternal exile; conjoined they give it its place in the Cosmos.

In the spiritual world the "Father in Heaven" reveals Himself also under this same law of Duality: "I form the light and create darkness; I make good and create evil."[2] And His name as the attractive power in His human family is Jesus; to the repulsive power is given the name of Satan. If it be objected here (*a*) that to raise Satan to the dignity of a Divine potency is to bring "Evil" into

[1] "Strife is the father of things." And: "The One setting itself at variance with itself, harmonizes with itself, like the harmony of the bow and the viol." And again: "Unite the whole and the not-whole, the coalescing and the not-coalescing, the harmonious and the discordant, and thus we have the One becoming from the All and the All from the One." Hippolytus in tracing the heresy of Noetus to Heraclitus takes occasion to quote several sayings of this Greek Hegelian (*Ref.* ix. 3-5).

[2] Isa. xlv. 7; the good and evil here, however, are hedonistic.

the very heart of God, and (*b*) to give an account of him which is inconsistent with his description in the Bible, it is replied that (*a*) if Satan exist he is either dependent on God or independent. If dependent his very existence depends also on the fact that something of God's power is his to keep him in being, and that something, therefore, is good; or he is independent, in which case we are forced back on what we have already rejected, Manichaean dualism. Hence God's presence and power are in Satan as in everything God has called into existence.

(*b*) To the second objection the rejoinder is made that it is not wholly or even largely true, or true to any appreciable extent, except possibly in that singular book the Apocalypse of St. John.[1] Otherwise, where Satan is named his character is consistent with his being the *Resister of God by God's own appointment.*[2] And it is pointed out that virtue cannot be said to exist until it has passed through a crisis, or a series of crises, where the higher good was not merely preferred to some lower good, but was gained only after a struggle

[1] In the forty Bible passages where the name Satan is mentioned (omitting the seven in Revelation), three only point to him as delighting in wickedness, viz. Luke xiii. 16, Acts v. 3, 1 Tim. v. 15; the rest are consistent with his character as the Adversary, and leave the question open whether he is to be regarded as the Power which tests man to make him see what he is, or as a person who takes pleasure in causing us to fall. It is worth noting that all the references to Satan, except seven, are in the N.T.

[2] Cf. Francis Thompson's lines:

> "So still the ruler by the ruled takes rule,
> And wisdom weaves itself in the loom o' the fool.
> . . . . . .
> Did not obstruction's vessel hem it in,
> Force were not force, would spill itself in vain;
> We know the Titan by his champèd chain."
>
> *The Child-Woman.*

and self-sacrifice, in which was involved some measure of real resistance to a force which threw its sword into the scale of the lower good. The good action is the outcome of a good-will, and a good-will is not a mere impulse, but settled knowledge of what is right, and not only knowledge of it, but agreement with it, and agreement with it against stress of opposition.[1] Hence it would seem that, if virtue is to be attained at all, the nature of things must contain some provision for the opposition required if virtue is to be born and grow to maturity, just as molar motion requires the resistance of friction, and a leap into the air would be impossible but for the resistance of the ground. This power does exist in the moral order, and its name in the Bible is "Satan."

That there is much truth in this last account of Satan or Evil as a cosmic principle will be admitted probably by most candid minds, but even if it does account for cosmic Evil, if it does not account for the evil known in detail by experience, is it entitled to regard itself as an adequate explanation, and is it of much practical service, seeing that the evil that affects us practically is that which occurs in the single experiences of daily life? Must not any theory of Evil to be sufficient tell us why the lower animals suffer, why so much physical and mental suffering are to be found which, as far as we can see, do nothing to aid the growth of virtue, why the innocent suffer and the guilty escape? In short, if we are to hold fast to our belief in God's perfection in Wisdom and Love, must we not decide to join ourselves with Leibnitz in rejecting His omnipotence? Lastly, the many Biblical refer-

[1] Cf. Lotze, *Microcosmus*, ii. 720.

ences to the Devil [1] must at least be dealt with before our theory of Evil is complete, and also—what can hardly be over-emphasised—any mere economic explanation of Evil fails to account for its *malignity*. But the common sense of mankind, and the testimony of all the saints is express on the malignity of evil.

It is this malignity which forbids us to be content with the explanation afforded by the undoubted fact of the Law of Dualism, and forces us to conjecture that at work in the world somehow are personal Beings of superhuman, perhaps gigantic powers, who are so far gone from original righteousness as to find their pleasure in thwarting the ends of Divine Goodness. But this is to confess that the problem of Evil is ultimately insoluble by us. We must, therefore, when we attempt to deal with it, not only allow for the Resister whom God has appointed, but also for the Lover-of-Evil, whom God permits. The former is a fact, the latter a probability. It would be convenient if theological usage would agree to call the former Satan, and the latter the Devil.[2] We will anyhow take the liberty of using this distinction here.

The Son of Man then submits Himself to Satan as the great Tester, even as all things from the lowest to the highest grow to their perfection by overcoming the resistance offered to their progress by their environment. Virtue is the product of a

[1] The word "devil" or "devils" occurs seventy-eight times in the Bible, of which all but four are in the N.T. A similar proportion occurs in the use of "Satan." The devil (or devils) is represented as the cause of various kinds of sickness, of sin, and as (like Satan) the tempter of man. In Revelation only are the Devil and Satan expressly identified.

[2] "Diabolus non speciale nomen est, sed commune; operis enim nomen est, non naturae" (*Quaest. V. et N.T.*, quoted by Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, 1879, p. 362).

happy mean between fostering care and hostile opposition. As Satan desired to have Peter for sifting,[1] so as the "authority of darkness,"[2] he seized his Master, and so does he test each disciple through his appointed agents. Of these, four bulk large in the story of the Passion, the scribes and priests, Herod, Judas, and Pilate.

(*a*) *The Ecclesiastical System.*—We must distinguish under this term two opposite conditions of Church-life: the ideal, where the Church in its head and in its members is open-eyed, loyal, truth-loving, and humane; the fallen, where the Church has lost its savour, has made terms with the world, basks in Court-favour, or manages the "civium ardor prava iubentium" for its own interests. The former, some would be disposed to say, is no empirical body, but is the Church of Christ as it exists in the Divine Idea, while the latter may be found represented by every ecclesiastical body known to history.

The function of the ideal Church is to champion, to preserve, and to foster among men the principle of inner Freedom which at its highest is that "living Love that wills the blessedness of others." This presupposes of necessity that no other powers but those of the spiritual order are at its disposal. It cannot punish by fine or imprisonment, by exile or excommunication any of its brethren—a Brotherhood such as this knows nothing of governors and governed, of priests and laymen,—but is bound in honour and consistency to trust to the persuasive power of its own inner life, and not even to feel the temptation to apply any degree or kind of force whatsoever to the furtherance of its mission. This

[1] Luke xxii. 31. [2] Luke xxii. 53.

is the truth which the late Count Tolstoy insisted on, and had he restricted its application to the Church of Christ instead of extending it to the State his position would have been unassailable.

But "corruptio optimi pessima." The Church which is essentially a Brotherhood built up on Love and Freedom *may*—history almost declares *will*—degenerate into an institution of the civil pattern with officers, laws, penalties, and the whole paraphernalia of political institutions. In the last resort, such a body rests on force which is either naked and unashamed as when Calvin burned Servetus, or cowardly and hypocritical as when the various Inquisitions used the civil power as their tool.[1] Of such a Church Caiaphas is made the type, and with him are associated Scribes and Pharisees, chief priests, all men eminent for piety and respectability, and, therefore, able to carry with them the popular voice, to appeal, if need be, to the fact that everything had been done according to law, and when all was over to go home and thank God that one prophet the less was left to disturb their peace.

But evil as such a power is when judged by the standard of Love and Freedom, yet it is used as an instrument of Satan, the Tester, in order to perfect the Son of Man by compelling Him to resistance to death against all attempts to make Him false to His trust.

(*b*) *Herod.*—Gibbon in a famous remark to the

[1] Monsignor Benson, in that wrong-headed book, *The Dawn of All*, suggests that a State which is based on the dogmas of the Catholic Church, as *e.g.* in Spain, is bound to put to death heretics as bad citizens, seeing that they strike at the foundation of the State. This contention does not affect the iniquity of the ecclesiastics who murdered the Albigenses and burned Jeanne d'Arc.

effect that to the philosopher all religions are equally false, to the populace equally true, and to the magistrate equally useful,[1] has hit off the character of Herod. As a half-breed, in touch at once with Jewish piety and Roman state-craft, Herod represents that type of culture increasingly common in days like the present which regards religion as venerable, picturesque, and doubtful, but a fit subject for Concordats, Falk Laws, and Articles of Religion, to be delicately handled when it is strong, and to be mocked and set at naught when it is weak. Our only interest in this dilettante culture is that rotten at the heart though it be it contributes none the less its tribute of support to the work of Satan as the Tester of the sons of God.

(*c*) *Judas Iscariot.*—This character has received nothing but obloquy for the treachery which history lays to his charge, and for this the word "betray" applied to his action in the English version is to a large extent responsible. Yet the word throughout the narrative is παραδίδωμι, "hand over,"[2] and this is patient of a good as well as an evil connotation. If we adopt the distinction made above we may say that in so far as Judas acted as an agent of Satan, his function consisted in perfecting the machinery of the final testing; while in so far as his personal action was due to unregulated impulses, or to that evil state of the Self which gives life to debased desires and aversions (motives) which are the condition precedent of evil actions, he was doing the work of the Devil. But our judgment on the man ought not to restrict itself to the latter aspect, but also bear in mind that even Judas played

[1] *Decline and Fall*, ch. ii., Prof. Bury's ed., i. 28.
[2] Cf. Luke xxii. 4, 6.

a necessary part in the process by which the Son of Man went as it was written of Him.

(*d*) *Pontius Pilate.*—And so lastly we come to Pilate as the representative of the civil power, known as the State. The prominent position in wrong-doing assigned to Pilate is due to the correct judgment passed by the Early Church, and by every wise and just-thinking man of every Church, that the State as such is a monument of Evil, an excrescence on the community it oppresses under due forms of law. Just as we saw above that the true Church is a Brotherhood for the purposes of the Law of Freedom, but may degenerate into an ecclesiastical tyrant, so the community, which should also be a Brotherhood for the purposes of the Law of Necessity, may also degenerate into an engine of tyranny, by which a despot, or a ruling class, or, worst of all, the many oppress the private citizen and rob him of his legitimate liberty. Of such a class are all existing governments, and their evil character is made not a whit the less black because the people love to have it so. Indeed, it is on the very virtues of his victims that the modern Pilate thrives. The ordinary good man has all Hooker's respect for Law as the voice of God Himself, and shrinks with righteous horror from breaking it. But the State exploits this virtue of the good man, and thunders at him that its decrees are also "law," whereas they are but emergency makeshifts (generally noxious), and so he by a verbal quibble is made to transfer from Law as "a coherent, harmonious, and logical whole" to law as a skimble-skamble device the reverence which is due to the former, and to stifle the indignation due to the latter.

The amazing thing about the history of every Pontius Pilate is that he is supported most wholeheartedly of all people by those who profess and call themselves Christians, in disregard of the plain fact that their Master was oppressed by him, and that, therefore, they should expect to be treated likewise. If it be said that He bade us give to Caesar Caesar's we reply that this objection ignores the sharpness of the irony with which this so-called injunction was accompanied. "Since you are slaves who consent to use your master's money," it says in effect, "give him back what you have borrowed." But His own rule of conduct was different. When brought before civil authority, whether the Sanhedrim,[1] or Herod,[2] or Pilate,[3] He answered nothing; He refused to plead, because He did not admit the jurisdiction of any civil power over the Freedom of the individual. He submitted Himself without complaint to the indignities and cruelties which the civil power in its various forms saw fit to inflict, because He knew them to be the work of Satan as the lord of Form and the Tester of the saints, but He also saw in them the work of the Devil, and, therefore, by His silence He declared His judgment on usurped power, and by this very declaration laid the axe at the root of the tree of the State. That He did not come to found a Religion for Sunday use, or for the cloistered piety of delicate souls, apart from our ordinary rough-and-tumble life is seen in the letters of His great disciple, St. Paul, who, though he counselled obedience to the higher powers,[4] yet limited their jurisdiction by his judgment that they were "of God,"

[1] Matt. xxvi. 62. [2] Luke xxiii. 9.
[3] Matt. xxvii. 14. [4] Rom. xiii. 1.

and while he appealed himself to Caesar,[1] it was to him as the representative of justice.

Perhaps the recitation of the Apostles' Creed may be more living (even if less frequent) when it is realised that the reciter of it pledges himself when he says that he believes that Jesus Christ " suffered under Pontius Pilate " to that an-archism which is the necessary fruit of the Christian life.[2]

This doctrine of an-archism, some will think, has been stated here without the many necessary qualifications which are imposed by the very law of Duality referred to above. It is not true, it may be urged, that the Individual can be regarded as the one and only thing to be considered, or even that he can be regarded as superior in value to the community of which he is a member. For society is an organism, and in any organism each member is of less importance than the organism as a whole. The member is a means to that larger good which properly pertains to the organism alone, and hence as being the means and not the end it is relatively inferior.

This doctrine has become so fashionable under the suggestive influence of the conception of Evolution that its fundamental opposition to the Christian philosophy of life has been quietly overlooked. Yet the reasons for rejecting it are numerous.

(*a*) In the first place, the statement that we call Society an organism because it is the highest category at our disposal is not in accordance with

[1] Acts xxv. 11.

[2] Cf. R. Browning, " Luria," *sub finem* :

> " A people is but the attempt of many
> To rise to the completer life of one ;
> And those who live as models for the mass
> Are singly of more value than they all."

fact. A lion or an eagle as organisms are no doubt higher in the scale of being than a heap of stones. And if we thought of human society as an aggregate of atoms, whose only law was that each atom might do what it liked, provided that it did not encroach on the equal rights of others, then in comparison we might say that a society which is an organism is higher than a society which is an aggregate. But the comparison made is between two stages of the actual, two sections of the content of experienced Time, and takes no account of the ideal factor, which, starting from the ethical, looks not backwards but forwards, and instead of comparing two existing things tends to create some better thing.

(*b*) In the second place, the hint of this better thing has been given us already in the conception of men as free and self-conscious, that is, self-determining beings. The organism which is society is in the eyes of its devotees a Fate or Necessity over against its individual members. And this is a lower, if not an already obsolete estimate of the worth of individual man; it is a return to Nature as mechanical instead of an ascent to Spirit as conscious, and as obeying, therefore, the sole law of Freedom.

(*c*) In the third place the contention that the Individual is an abstraction and that Society is the concrete reality is as little an adequate account of the matter as the opposite contention that Society is an abstraction and the Individual the concrete reality. For both contentions embody different abstractions. The question is not which abstraction contains the greater amount of truth (or the less amount of error), for to determine this we must

first know the practical end for which the abstraction is made, and this is not always possible. The real question at issue is a judgment of value: Is the Individual as such a more valuable asset to the Universe than the Society? We are, of course, assuming, in asking this question, that both factors are present and active, that Society has been busy fashioning the Individual and the Individual active in reacting on Society. In this case there should be little hesitation in saying that inasmuch as the Individual represents the Freedom of the spiritual life and Society its conditions the Individual is of the higher worth. For the Individual as being an ethical expression is superior to anything which is but a means to ethics. And hence Society has but a Utilitarian function to discharge, that of subserving the highest good of the Individual.

That this question has something more than a political importance may be seen from the reflection that it is one of the conjectures of Pluralism that God may be not so much an individual as a harmonious Society of persons. This means the intrusion of a biological conception into a realm where such conceptions are, if not impertinent, at all events as inadequate as an attempt to state existence under four dimensions in terms of existence under three. "Real universality," says Hegel, "should not be confused with what is held in common," [1] and the reason, he says, why man rose so slowly to the consciousness of universality was that "man as man was not then recognised to be of infinite worth and to have infinite rights." And the reason why slavery has disappeared in Christian Europe is to be found in the fact that Christianity is the

[1] *Logic*, § 163, p. 252, Wallace's ed.

religion of absolute freedom. "What the slave is wanting in is the recognition that he is a person: and the principle of personality is universality." If I say that Epictetus is a Person I mean that the Absolute Idea of personality as a developed universal concentrates itself into a point which I call Epictetus. And it is impossible to allow another universal called the State to intervene and destroy the universality of the person. But absorption would here be destruction.

(*d*) Further, the history of savage tribes has made it clear that in primitive conditions of human life the individual man has no freedom of will within or action without. "In primitive thought most of what a man or woman does is actually and all is potentially taboo." [1] Custom, reinforced by fear, deprives early man of all spontaneity, and the State, that is the tribe, is master of him at every turn. Now the history of civilisation is the history of the emergence of individuality in man, the growing assertion as against the community of the right of the individual to be himself, to order his own life, to choose his own goods and to be free to develop himself as the Life within him dictates. This emancipation from outside control has always been of slow growth and has been continuously saved, except at rare intervals, from going too fast by the power still enjoyed by the State. Finally, there comes a time when the restrictions of taboo have done their work, when the Individual has out of the very nettle of his limitations plucked the flower of personality, and now, unless corruption set in, on one side or the other, both the Individual and the Community are in accord because both are

[1] Crawley, *The Mystic Rose*, p. 30.

seen to be mutually serviceable. But the process is significant for our present purpose, as it shows a gradual diminution of the taboos of the State, and a corresponding liberation of the innate powers of the Individual.

(*e*) The real relation of the Individual to the State is that of Life to Form, which is to say that the two are necessary the one to the other, for Life without its Form is ineffective and Form without Life is dead. But the same relation may be expressed as being that of Freedom and Necessity, and every respectable judgment of value places the former over the latter. For Necessity is mechanism and mechanism is always subordinate to Life. Hence the State is the servant of the Individual and not his master.

(*f*) Much of the confusion which envelops this whole subject seems to be caused by a confusion of different senses of the two terms Society and State. That man is a member of society, in hourly contact with his fellows, acted on by them and reacting on them in his turn, that, therefore, the very nature of things insists that some *modus vivendi* shall be found to pacify his relations to them is obvious enough. But what does not seem so obvious, even to eminent writers on the subject, is that when Society secures this pacification by coercion, that is, by laws with sanctions, it is an entirely different thing from a Society which takes the trouble to persuade its members of a principle which shall by its own inner attraction induce them to be just and unselfish. These two forms of Society are so radically opposed that they have nothing in common but the fact that they both consist of a plurality. Ethically, and from the point of view of efficiency,

they are to one another as Evil is to Good. For the one rests on Force, that is, violent encroachment on the natural rights of the individual, defined as the rights which he *ought* to be allowed to enjoy; and the other trusts to Love, or that all-governing inner principle which more than freedom, more than justice is the one and only cement of human society.

If we want two names for these two mutually exclusive forms of Good and Evil, we may call them Socialism and Democracy, provided that we understand that by Socialism is meant State Socialism, or the system under which the State would be omnipotent and the Individual a mere object for regimentation; and by Democracy not the shoddy imitation of it we now see around us, but a society ruling itself by Love, Freedom, and the recognition of Duty. But this is but to say Christianity. And this is what is meant by saying that Pontius Pilate in our story is a type of any Society which trusts to force and has no practical belief in God or Love or Duty, which is the kind of Society that is being industriously cultivated in this country at present.

The ambiguity in the term "State" is parallel to that in the term "Society." Those who think biologically like to regard the State as but Society organised for the common good, and in this way they get rid of all contradiction between the Individual and the Community. Were their analogy of the organism correctly applied it would imply of necessity that the two spheres of interest, that of the Individual and that of the Community, never had been set in opposition because they never could be. And this would be absurd, for if

it were true the French Revolution was a causeless miracle, Philip of Spain and Alva were after all but interpreting the wishes of those they murdered in the Inquisition, and Charles I. was beheaded to show how heartily Pym and Cromwell agreed with him. From this absurdity we can escape only by abandoning the analogy of the State to an organism as a superstition.

Mr. Wallace says: "The State in the phrase 'state interference' is generally used to mean the abstract universal of the State, not looked at as a germ of development outwards, but as a mere form of authority or government—a shell left behind by the spirit when it takes another shape. The so-called notion of the State has been arrested in its development, at the point of abstract universality: and the mere formula of rule or government has been taken up by the presentative intellect and turned into a picture with generalised outlines." [1] But what Mr. Wallace gives here as a dialectic process of thought meets us also in the objective world of fact as the process which the State has unfortunately been the victim of at the hands of sciolists. Hegel, distinguishing, as he did, the *State* from *Society*, was able to justify his position that the object of the State is freedom [2] by maintaining the thesis that the State arises from Society to ensure that the individual shall be fully realised, chiefly through his own conscious action. The State guarantees him his individuality which Society with its self-seeking struggle of competitors tends to efface. With this we have no quarrel, and need only add that this sound result is arrived at through

[1] *Prolegomena to the Logic of Hegel*, p. cxliii.

[2] Free acts being defined as rational acts.

no analogy of organism borrowed from biology, and that the correctness of this theoretical judgment is no guarantee that the actual State will find in its functionaries sufficient self-restraint to enable them to keep their hands off the individual himself. Most of them seem to want to do the "self-realising" of the individual for him.[1] Most of the difficulties with which these writers deal arise from forgetfulness of the fact[2] that the State is the term of earlier and ruder organisations and the seed-bed for others. Its mission is, like that of John Baptist, to get through its work as soon as possible and then make way for some one better.

The other theory of the State maintains that it is an excrescence on the Community at one stage, and at a lower stage an institution peculiar to barbarism. Perhaps we should not look for the State distinctively in the savage condition, for in that the individual is as such hardly yet born, and hence while his tribe is omnipotent over him it has not yet differentiated itself against him. But at the barbarous stage the Individual is there, although he is as yet a slave, and is oppressed by the man, or the caste, which can manipulate force in its interest at his expense. And wherever this is done, as it is done in the State of to-day, we have a proof that we have not yet to any large extent shaken ourselves free from earlier barbarism. So long as the history of a community consists in the story of a struggle of one class to retain powers of coercion over the other classes, or of the success or failure of these other classes to emancipate

[1] Cf. D. G. Ritchie, *Principles of State Interference*, 1902; T. H. Green, "Principles of State Obligation," *Works*, 1911, vol. ii. pp. 113-136.

[2] Emphasised by Green.

themselves, you have a confession that the State is for both barbarous. And this is what we mean when we say that Pontius Pilate represents the State as an "Evil" thing, because he represents Force as against Love, utilitarianism as against moral values, and mechanism as opposed to Life. The "State" in this later sense belongs to Satan; the Church [1] belongs to Christ. And it is the fate of the kingdoms of this world to become the kingdom of our God.

[1] In the sense to be discussed later.

CHAPTER XI

THE FOURTH ARTICLE (*continued*)

Was crucified, dead, and buried

On two occasions before His crucifixion Jesus spoke of the Cross [1] as something which must be accepted by each of His disciples as a condition of discipleship. He could not have anticipated that all His disciples would be the victims of literal crucifixion; nor could He have been referring (like the Latin *cruciare*) to torments or sufferings in general, however caused, for He connects inseparably the Cross with discipleship. It seems clear, therefore, that we must look away from the literal if we are to understand the meaning and place of Crucifixion in the life of Religion, or at all events must extract from the literal its hidden meaning if we are to give it efficacy.

In the last chapter we saw reason for believing that the sufferings of Jesus under Pontius Pilate were typical life-sufferings, and, therefore, a presumption exists that the Crucifixion is also a life-process which goes steadily to its climax. This is confirmed not only by the above references to His Cross made by Jesus Himself, but from the applica-

[1] Matt. x. 38 = to Luke xiv. 27, and Matt. xvi. 24 = to Mark viii. 34, Luke ix. 23.

tion of it made by St. Paul. He speaks of Christ crucified as being, *qua* crucified, the "power of God and the wisdom of God," and contrasts this power and wisdom with the signs for which the Jews looked and with the wisdom beloved by the Greeks.[1] A crucified Christ, therefore, transcends the historical and the individual. Again St. Paul says of himself that he is crucified with Christ [2] where the similar nature of the act points to a spiritual process in both. So Christ's disciples are said to have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts.[3] Self-indulgence is contradictory of the Cross.[4] In the suggestive passage, Eph. ii. 11-18, the abolition of all merely formal differences in religion by the spiritual living power of crucifixion is emphasised. Obviously, this power is not to be sought for in the mere historical but in the spiritual process, of which the historical crucifixion is the cognate expression.

Moreover, this method of dealing with the Cross and Crucifixion finds support in analogous references to other events in the life of Christ. We are "buried with Him"; [5] "risen with Him"; [6] "dead with Him"; [7] made to "sit with Him in heavenly places." [8] It is impossible to interpret such passages of literal and physical burial, death, resurrection, and ascension, but they all become crystal-clear when we realise that they refer to the same spiritual process which runs its course in the Master and in the disciple alike. He fought His way through the Valley of the dark Shadow, and came out of it triumphantly into the light. They, stimulated by

[1] 1 Cor. i. 18-25. [2] Gal. ii. 20. [3] Gal. v. 24.
[4] Phil. iii. 18. [5] Rom. vi. 4. [6] Col. iii. 1.
[7] Col. iii. 3. [8] Eph. ii. 6.

His example, and (which is more potent) helped by the spiritual power He has now authority to supply, are engaged in fighting each his own battle, in killing the lower, dying to self, and, therefore, they are *pari passu* rising out of the earth-life and are ascending to the heavenly.

For the doctrine of the Cross is the doctrine of the expulsion of Egoism by Love—not of Hatred by Love, for Hatred and Love are necessary complements to one another—but of Egoism by Love. Egoism is the name given to the spiritual principle of wickedness within, which is recognised most commonly as selfishness in daily life, and finds expression in the many failures, sins, and meannesses with which we are all tainted. If sin be lawlessness,[1] lawlessness is rooted in Egoism; if it is darkness it is because egoism blinds the eye of the Spirit;[2] if it is a lie it is because it takes the part for the whole, and makes itself its own God.[3]

Two writers have set out for us in different ways but with masterly skill the natural history of Egoism: La Rochefoucauld in his *Moral Maxims and Reflections*, and George Meredith in the *Egoist*. According to the former, "Self-love is the love of a man's self, and of everything else for his own sake. It makes people idolaters to themselves and tyrants to all the world besides, that is, whenever they have the opportunity of showing it."

"It never rests or fixes anywhere from home," but if it does for a moment dwell upon some other thing, it is "only as bees do when they light upon flowers, with a design to draw all the virtue there to their own advantage."

It is "raging and violent" in its desires; "close

[1] ἀνομία, 1 John iii. 4. [2] 1 John ii. 11. [3] Rom. i. 25.

in its Designs," is "concealed from its own self"; its inner world is filled with shameful things, "many of them so monstrous that when they come to birth it cannot be prevailed upon to own them."

"In a word, all its care is to subsist, and rather than not be at all it is content to be its own enemy."

With equal mordancy George Meredith etches for us in Sir Willoughby Patterne the polished egoist who treats everybody as mere food for his vanity and self-pleasing. "Fiercely imaginative in all that concerns himself the social egoist has discovered a greater realm than that of the sensual appetites—a kingdom about which he rushes invading and harrying with all the victorious pride of an Alexander. He goes forth conquering and to conquer, to realise, enjoy himself in others."

Each of these two extraordinary works is the Egoist's Horn-book, and should be digested by everybody who wants to understand the disease from which the Christ saves us. The habit of looking on our friends, our business, our pastimes, and on the world in general as a sort of treasure-house put there for what reasons we know not, but in any case full of rare and precious things which we can snatch and enjoy all to ourselves, is the habit of mind which is sin, darkness, and falsehood. Not the world as our football—or our oyster which we will open with our sword—but as God's world of which we are a part; as a battle-field where our place and duty are assigned to us; as a furnace of affliction in which we are being purified; as a thing of beauty in which we may find occasion for losing ourselves in love and joy—that is what Christ bids us to regard the world as being. We are to despise comfort, care nothing for applause,

cease from self-introspection, and open out the flower of our soul to the sunshine of God's love.

The process by which Egoism is broken down in order that Love may replace it is called the Cross of Christ—the Cross that Christ bore, the Cross that He lays on His followers. It is characterised by suffering, limitation, purgation, death. It is the Power which dispels the darkness that hides man from himself, which seeks to persuade him that the course of his evolution upwards out of body, through soul, to spirit, is a direct copy of his constitution ; it liberates the Soul from slavery to the body, and the Spirit from the usurpation of its rights by the Soul ; it restores man's personality to the Spirit to which it rightly belongs, and initiates a process which ends in Peace. But its mode of working, called Crucifixion, is hard and repugnant to the psychical man, for like the prisoner in the Bastille who had learned to love his prison, the soul it is which will benefit by redemption, and in its state of sin it resists the redemptive process.

We may, if we please, give the name of *asceticism* to the crucified life, if only we remember that asceticism is not an end but a means, that there is no virtue in self-denial or self-discipline in and for itself, but that it is the necessary and imperative condition of escape from darkness into light and from disease into health.[1] On the other hand—

[1] Cf. the lines :

> " The narrow, thorny path be trod ;
> ' Come into my joy,' said God ;
> The sad ascetic shook his head :
> ' I've lost all taste for joy,' he said."

And also : " It needs little reflection to show that self-sacrifice for its own sake is always irrational and immoral. It is the object for which the sacrifice is made that gives it its moral value " (Rashdall, *Theory of Good and Evil*, ii. 70).

and perhaps the danger here is greater—we must remember that without self-discipline no redemption is effective, for whatever God does for us or offers to us is not ours without the active co-operation of our will put forth into action, and this voluntary action of ours consists in the inhibition of all acts, whether inner or outer, which are inconsistent with the Divine Life in us. It would be, however, a mistake to suppose that Crucifixion in all cases includes suffering, for if Crucifixion be a law of all life it has its root in the Divine Nature, and if suffering as we know it be conditioned by sin, then the Crucifixion of a sinless being is the Crucifixion of one who does not suffer because he is himself personally a sinner. On the other hand, there may be—the highest minds affirm that there is—a suffering through sympathy which far exceeds the suffering caused by sin. Let us see then briefly what is meant by Crucifixion (*a*) as a law of Divine Life, (*b*) as a law of Creation, (*c*) as a law of the life of the Christ, and (*d*) as the law of regeneration in ourselves.

(*a*) *The Divine Crucifixion.*—Crucifixion essentially is the negation of solitariness and of self-sufficiency; or to put it positively, it is the going out from self and putting our happiness in the keeping of another. The ground of this Crucifixion is in the very being of the Blessed Trinity, apart from any reference to creation or redemption. For the very possibility of creation itself rests on the distinction of eternal Energies in the Divine Nature; on the Divine Will by virtue of which God desires eternally an adequate object of His love, and therefore begets the Son, in whom He knows Himself completely reflected as His Logos, whereupon the

same loving Will which had gone out to the Son, being hypostatised (as is necessary to be thought), returns to the Father as the Spirit. "If I were to picture to the senses in a figure the process of the Trinity, I would paint a fiery circle as the symbol of the fiery loving will of the Father; and in this circle a sunlight centre as the symbol of the Son—the object of love, which lights the whole infinite depth of the divine nature of love; and, proceeding from this sunlight centre to the circumference of the fiery circle, an abundance of rays, as the symbol of the triumph of love going forth from the Father through the Son, and entirely filling Father and Son." [1]

Anselm's famous argument (with a difference) may be applied here. He argued that the idea of a Being than which a greater cannot be conceived "is a necessary idea, and clear as daylight, so to speak; one which is an innate possession of the thinking mind: clear and precise and self-evident. There must be some explanation of it; and the simplest explanation is that it is evoked by the operation of an Object, of a Reality." [2] Similarly, we may say that since the idea of God as containing in Himself all the treasures of the Manifold in a living Unity, is a higher idea than that of a sterile God "orbed in self-isolation," and so sundered from His world to which He stands in a causal relation only, a relation not vital, therefore the idea of the Trinity is a higher idea than that of the mono-

[1] Fr. Delitzsch, *System of Biblical Psychology*, 1879, p. 204. Cf. "Sicut dum Pater se ipsum in essentia sua contemplatur, verbum mentis exprimit et sic Filium generat: ita dum Pater et Filius se in unitate essentiae diligunt, affectus voluntatis qui est utriusque amor, simul ab utroque exprimitur sicque Spiritus Sanctus producitur" (*ibid.* p. 57).

[2] Caldecott, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 28.

theistic Allah, or the Jewish Jehovah. The truth that God is love is a possible truth only if God be a Plurality; all that can be deduced from the truth that God is One alone is that He is force. Hence, if Crucifixion is essentially the going out of self through love to another, then it is an inner law of the nature of God Himself, and all earthly crucifixion, when purged of its accidental or temporal elements, finds its root and prototype in the love of the Father for His Son effectuated by His Spirit.[1]

(*b*) *Crucifixion as a Law of Creation.*—Whatever God does He does freely, under no external compulsion, such as the Greeks thought of when they placed Ἀνάγκη as the Power behind the throne of Zeus. The freedom of God is indeed a freedom which is identical with the inner necessity of His Being; His will is not arbitrary but is formed by His counsel,[2] and because that "counsel" is perfect in wisdom God cannot do anything but what is perfect in goodness, beauty, and truth, or in other words His actions are not only perfect but necessary; they cannot be anything different from what they are. Hence the cosmos is the necessary expression not only of God's will but of His wisdom and love, and in this sense it is true that "everything is for the best in the best of all possible worlds," for if a better world were possible God would have called it into being, and if things could be better in this actual world God would make them better. Otherwise He would not be God. But every cause finds itself again in its effect, passes over from itself to

[1] "Les perfections de Dieu sont celles de nos âmes, mais il les possède sans bornes; il est un océan dont nous n'avons reçu que des gouttes. Il y a en nous quelque puissance, quelque connaisance, quelque bonté, mais elles sont toutes entières en Dieu" (Leibnitz, *Théodicée*, Preface).

[2] Eph. i. 11.

it, and hence the world which is the effect of the unceasing creative act of God is determined in its nature not only by what God wills but by what God is, for what He does is the expression of what He is.[1] Hence the cosmos is the " Glory of God " ; " the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handy-work." [2] " Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts : the whole earth is full of His glory." [3] " In His temple doth every one utter ' Glory.' " But if the root of God's perfection is His love, and if Crucifixion be the expression of love, then the world proceeding from God is His crucifixion and such a crucifixion is His sevenfold *Doxa*, or Glory.

From which it follows that the " glory " of the creature must be consubstantial with the " glory " of God, and reflect in the laws of its actions the divine impulse to self-impartation. Perhaps, therefore, instead of declaiming against Nature as " red in tooth and claw with ravine," we should see in this involuntary sacrifice of individuals or of species for the needs of others an adumbration of that higher law of self-sacrifice, *i.e.* of Crucifixion, through which God the Father eternally gives Himself to His Son through the Spirit and eternally receives again through the same Spirit the fulness of His gift to the bliss of the One and undivided Trinity. On the egoistic theory this world is a slaughter-house ; by the law of Crucifixion it is Love's sacrificial altar.

(*c*) *Crucifixion of the Christ.*—Jesus Christ, as we have seen above, is the Eternal Logos appearing

[1] " E il ciel cui tanti lumi fanno bello,
dalla mente profonda che lui volve
prende l' image, e fassene suggello."
DANTE, *Paradiso*, ii. 130-2.

[2] Ps. xix. 1.

[3] Isa. vi. 3, Ps. xxix. 8.

as man, eating, drinking, feeling, thinking, and willing as man. Like unto us in all things, and yet unlike us in one grace to which we have not yet attained. That one thing is the marvellous constancy of the power of love in Him. The fulness and depth of this divine love in Him are to be seen as truly in His denunciation of the Pharisees for following a lower rule than that of love as in the unbroken series of His own loving acts for others; as truly in the intellectual asceticism He spontaneously adopted as in what He did say in praise of divine charity. For He knew that it is not so much by what a man says that he influences others as by what he does, or rather it is by what he is as the product of all his past acts. Hence when one of His apostles came to sum up His mode of Life, he could find no more worthy testimony to give than that He went about doing good.[1] But the authority He won was not won by the impression He made on His contemporaries, but in the inner world where the Father rewards in secret.[2] For the law of Crucifixion, or the law of self-impartation for the good of others, has for its proper result the transference of the Ego from being a living soul (ψυχὴ ζῶσα) to a quickening spirit (πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν).[3] In other words, Jesus Christ was not a mere recipient of a derived life which the phrase "living soul" denotes, but won the right and the power to be an active centre of life-giving activity for others. He established His human nature in the higher realm of the spirit, where is to be found man's true likeness to God, of which active giving out to others at all costs to self is the prime characteristic, and not a bland acceptance of all that others

[1] Acts x. 38. [2] Matt. vi. 4. [3] 1 Cor. xv. 45.

may offer. Hence by a lifelong obedience to the law of Crucifixion even at the cost of such suffering within and without as was entailed by entrance into a sin-stricken family, He entered on His inheritance of a Manhood which was now endowed with God's own attribute of joy in service, of active self-giving that others too might share His deific life. Through Crucifixion He became the quickener of others.

(*d*) *Crucifixion as the Law of Christian Life.*—It is in human life that the Law of Crucifixion comes to its sharpest expression. For in sub-human levels it is obeyed unconsciously through the pressure of the environment, and in super-human it is obeyed through love, but in the human it is both known and disobeyed. In consequence the Law which moves solemnly and smoothly in the celestial spheres, without repugnance, and therefore without suffering, enters when it comes to man into the cloud and loses its brightness. Thenceforward men enter through much tribulation into the kingdom of God, which is the kingdom of righteousness, and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.[1] For a fatal cleft is felt within as soon as the bright beams of light of the Spirit of God illuminate the darkness of the psychical man; with one side of his now half-awakened nature he longs for the upper air, but with the other he clings to his egoistic phantasms. He sees the good and approves it, but he follows the worse. Conscience, whether as the voice of God within or the active consciousness of a divine law imprinted on the inner constitution of man,[2] testifies

[1] Rom. xiv. 17.

[2] The schoolmen named that faculty by which man has an habitual knowledge of the Divine Will in general *synderesis* or *synteresis*, while they gave the name of *conscience* to this same faculty when specifically declaring that knowledge in individual instances.

to what ought to be done, while experience tells the sad tale of conscience violated, or at best obeyed reluctantly. But when the grace of God becomes the effective supporter of conscience the struggle to obey becomes more and more strenuous, and victory over the egoistic tendency more frequent. Hence arises a gradually growing depression of egoism and a growing exaltation of divine love in the soul, and though the conflict be protracted and the final victory seem ever on the horizon, yet Crucifixion is doing its work and love is entering on its own.

That this process of Crucifixion demands continual watchfulness and frequent agonies of prayer, that it insists on the right eye being plucked out and the right hand being cut off,[1] is an accident, not a property of Crucifixion. Such mortification is incidental to Crucifixion in sinful men because of the hostility that our deep-rooted Egoism offers to divine love, but in God and His angels Crucifixion is not a painful effort but a joy, seeing that the Divine Nature is essentially expansive and joy-giving[2] and that His angels rejoice as He rejoices over one sinner that repenteth.[3] So of Jesus Himself it is said that His life of crucifixion was a joy because of the well-spring of heavenly hope that refreshed Him within,[4] and even in our own sinful condition the pain of Crucifixion is outweighed with increasing velocity by the joy which springs up in the wake of the growing reunion with God and the steady diminishing of the *Turba*, or confusion which sin has introduced into our complex nature.

Crucifixion, viewed under this special aspect

[1] Matt. v. 30.
[2] Matt. v. 45.
[3] Luke xv. 7.
[4] Heb. xii. 2.

of its unifying effect, is called the At-one-ment, or reconciliation of opposites (καταλλαγή). The first at-one-ment and that which is constitutive of all others is that which takes place between the human Ego and God; and as this is the most important of all, so is it the most mysterious. For what our Ego is in itself no one knows or can know; all that we know of it is relative to the several parts of our tripartite (or dual) nature—our spirit, soul, and body—on the one side, and to God on the other. And even what we know through the first relation is as darkness if the light of the latter be removed, the Ego's knowledge of its own spirit, soul, or body, is wavering and misleading, like wreckers' lights, if the ceaselessly revolving light of the divine light-house be extinguished. But when the man has been led by the Spirit to submit to the law of Crucifixion, first of all his own spirit begins to surrender itself to the Spirit of God; then his soul, which is the external side of his spirit, becomes one with its spiritual principle, and lastly the body with all its powers surrenders to its own proximate principle, the soul. But the at-one-ment which is wrought within by the harmonising of spirit, soul, and body is the fruit and not the pre-condition of the deeper at-one-ment which through the Crucifixion of the sinful and dissipated Ego has been made between the ideal Ego and God.

CHAPTER XII

THE FOURTH ARTICLE (*continued*)

Dead

'Αποθανόντα

As Crucifixion is essentially an inner process, and only secondarily an outer event, so is death ; indeed, the " death " of this article is the consummation of the mystic process of Crucifixion. For as Crucifixion issues in the at-one-ment of the true Ego with God, and hence makes it to be a life-giving Spirit, so on the reverse side it imports the death of the false Ego with its *ἀντίμιμον πνεῦμα*. Being dead to sin the true Ego is now free with that inner freedom to live its own native life in God which it was destined for before it deliberately chose the slavery of sin. Death and life are inseparably united because they are the two correlative sides of one and the same thing. " Death is the veil which those that live call life," says Shelley, and similarly Heraclitus says, " While we live our souls are dead in us, but when we die our souls are restored to life."

The point of view we take is determined by our spiritual position. Those who find their satisfaction in egoistic delights regard physical death, or any accident which robs temporal things of their sweetness, as the greatest of all evils, as death indeed in

its full rigour, and for the same reason they must regard the life of regeneration which others tell of as death to them. On the other hand, the man who has once tasted of the powers of the aeon to come [1] finds lower pleasures distasteful and sometimes disgusting, and regards those under their sway as already dead, while he cannot but know that to him life consists in being dead to these lower things. Thus the death which follows on Crucifixion is the negative side of that life into which Crucifixion is the porchway entrance. It is a sort of spiritual callousness to the things which are beneath.

This callousness, however, if we may so call the Christian's immunity from the lusts of the flesh, is no mere hardening of the feelings, but is rather due to their being refined and clarified to such a degree that a positive delight in the things of the spirit fills the heart to the exclusion of all the pleasures of lower ranges of being. Just as when attention is fixed on one object predominantly other objects fall into the background of perception and fail to reach the centre of the field of consciousness, so when the stream of inner life has begun to run steadily in the direction of God, all side-currents and all under-currents are drawn into its main movements as tributaries.

The mystic truth then of Death is that which is stated in the aphorism: "Whosoever shall will to save his soul shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his soul for My sake shall find it," [2] the force

[1] Heb. vi. 5.

[2] Matt. xvi. 25, Mark viii. 35, Luke ix. 24. The substantiality of the Soul cannot be supported by this passage without some risk, since the term may be but a periphrasis for self, in the absence of any equivalent in Aramaic for this latter term. "Ye shall find rest to yourselves" is the meaning of Matt. xi. 29.

of which is brought out by the verse preceding it in each Synoptic: "If any one wills to come after Me, let him deny himself, and let him take up his cross, and (so) let him become My follower." The whole saying is paradoxical, as all truths of the spiritual life are, because every such truth transcends logic and therefore when expressed in terms of logic is at once essentially true and apparently false. The truth which here struggles for expression is the truth of the Ideal Ego and the Empirical Ego, to use the terms of philosophy; the truth of the spiritual Ego and the psychical Ego, to use the terms of religion.

Each of us finds himself at birth and afterwards throughout life in a given position, placed under the influence of a given environment without any choice or knowledge of his own. Moreover, we find ourselves, as we grow in self-knowledge, to be fenced round not merely by our external circumstances, but also by a given inner nature, mental disposition, system of feelings, and individual conative tendency which limit us and determine our conduct at every moment. If now we are content to accept this our natural state as a practical ultimate we take up what is commonly known as an egoistic attitude, and this in one of two ways. We either, if we are of proud and independent spirit, kick against our natural pricks, and refuse to be bound by our birth's invidious bar, but go out into the world instead to seize what we can of its treasures, that so we may add acquired riches to the volume of our natural inheritance; or, if we are of a soft, and easy-going, and slothful disposition, we immerse ourselves in what we have somehow come into possession of and make it

subserve our comfort. In either case we seek to " save our soul " as the Gospel phrases it, and by so doing we lose it.

But, on the other hand, the Ego may feel the touch of a life which is super-sensual—or to use the phrase suggested by our text, super-psychical, that is, which does not belong to the " soul " that has turned its face eagerly, whether with defiance or subserviency, on the sensual world, but belongs to a higher realm of Being. This Ego may realise that self-assertion against the universe is death, and that life is to be found in a voluntary ranging of itself among the forces which are here to do the Will of God. It may at the same time discover its own want of inner harmony, and its consequent inability to do the thing it sees to be right, and so be led to seek and to find a Presence and a Power which can restore its lost harmony and strengthen its feeble will. In other words, it may learn to transcend the natural life of its soul, and to gain liberation for its spirit, and by an act of free self-determination it may then commit itself and its ways to God, and discover that His service is perfect freedom. In ceasing to care for its soul the Ego has in the Biblical sense lost it, or we might reverse the saying and say that the soul has lost the Ego, but in exchange the Ego has found the Christ who is the Dweller in the Innermost, and in finding Him it has " found its soul," for, for the first time, that soul can now discharge its task of mediation between spirit and body freely and fully.

In the language of our Creed, the soul which has accompanied the whole man through his Crucifixion is now lifted up to the height of the spiritual life and is *dead* to the separateness of Egoism.

Buried

ταφέντα

The burial of Jesus Christ by Joseph of Arimathaea is a Divine symbol of a threefold process of burial in the world: the burial of God in everything that has become, the burial of the spirit of man in his external form, and the burial of the Old Man by the power of Christ.

(*a*) The thought that God is present in His world in the same sense that man's spirit is present in his body is an example of an anthropomorphism which is as legitimate as it is necessary. It underlies all Oriental speculation; it formed the substrate of Stoic thought; it penetrated, as the Wisdom-literature testifies, even the hard shell of Jewish monotheism; it finds expression in St. Paul's "in Him we live and move and have our being";[1] it is implicit in the definition of God as Love,[2] for it is a property of love not to rest content before it has given itself to the closest intimacy with its object; it gives the only rational ground for the omniscience and omnipotence of God, for how better can He be thought to know our thoughts long before than by being Himself the very ground out of which they spring, the life itself that calls them into life?

Nor can this truth be set aside by any attempt, out of reverence for the holiness or immutable majesty of God, to set up a rigid distinction between the Spirit which creates and the spirit which is created, seeing that that which is created exists only by virtue of the unceasing energy of God which fills it according to its capacity. "At bottom

[1] Acts xvii. 28. [2] 1 John iv. 16.

everything finite works only by that in it which makes it secretly better than it seems, by the essential power of the Infinite latent even in it; the power and capability of action belong not to the outer wrapping of particular properties, but solely to the core, in so far as therein developed." [1] It is not only man, therefore, that is made like God, but everything that God has called into existence possesses, as well as reflects, something of His goodness, and can persist only in virtue of the divine substance conferred on it, and of the unbroken continuity of its life which it shares in its degree with its Creator.

This truth of the burial of God in Nature may explain many of the curious phenomena of history. It lies, for example, at the root of the Nature-worship of antiquity and is its essential justification. The gods of heaven, Zeus, Phoibos Apollo, Pallas Athene, and Aphrodite, walked among men in the Greek world, for they were transcendent deities visiting this lower world occasionally and *ab extra*. But Dionysos had no place in heaven, and could not always be compelled from his hiding-place on earth; Demeter and Kore were for half the year inaccessible, and chthonian deities such as Asklepios must be sought for in their own homes. It is true that such worship of God in Nature was liable to excesses of feeling and iniquities of action; it is

[1] Lotze, *Microcosmus*, i. 384. Lotze goes on to show that this immanence of God in Nature is quite consistent with the mechanical working of Nature: "When we reduce all events in Nature to mechanical sequence, we act in accordance with the spirit of the Infinite, and show reverence to its ordinance; we do not set up mechanism in opposition to it as an independent, hostile power that it has to subdue, but we see in this the true efficacy of the Infinite, that which it would wish recognised throughout the world of phenomena as the hand by which its ends are accomplished" (*ibid.* i. 387).

true that it did not and could not satisfy men's thirst for Reality, but yet it has its place as a "praeparatio evangelica," and it may be that the Puritan world has done religion a disservice in extruding altogether from its precincts the God of the winds and the waves, of the sunset and the wayside flowers, of the lilies of the field and the birds of the air. Though God enshrines Himself supremely in the spirit of man, yet He is no less truly present in Nature, and a full-orbed worship will cause us to prostrate ourselves as well at His footstool as before His throne.

The poet and the lover of Beauty owe their inspiration, and indeed their very selves, to their power to recognise the God buried in His world, yet speaking from out of its heart, and making His continuous appeal to man as His elder child to see Him and respond in love. If Beauty be defined as the perfect union of spirit and form, then the step from the scientific affirmation of God's mechanical action in Nature to His vital presence in each object of Nature as Beauty is inevitable. For many the way of escape from utilitarianism or the lower hedonism is through the gate of Beauty. But no theory of Beauty which explains it as the result of contrivance, or as a mere language, or an intrusive extra, can fully account for its haunting power over feeling. That Nature is a tomb of the living God, which He, as it were, uses as His Delphic oracle, to tell us through what Nature is what He Himself is, is a postulate which can alone give any rational account of the Beauty without which stirs the heart within.

(*b*) Akin to the truth of the burial of God in His universe is the truth of the burial of man in his soul

and body. The two are related as the macrocosm to the microcosm. Man is made in the image and likeness of God, a likeness which has been dimmed by sin, but not extinguished or lost utterly. We may say indeed that the Eternal Logos being the image of God,[1] it is to the Logos that man is made like, and that, therefore, the Logos became incarnate in Jesus Christ in order to restore the brightness of the likeness, to rescue it from its disharmony, and to endue it with the power of life. But this restoration would have been impossible if it were true that man's likeness to God has been "absolutely lost through sin."[2] It is true that the N.T. speaks of a new creature,[3] but the newness of the spirit is in both cases relative to the oldness of the egoistic life, or of the external life, not assertive of a creation *ex nihilo*. Therefore as God is buried in His world, crucified in His world, so in a lower sense is the world made in His likeness—though the phrase itself is not scriptural the idea is, for it is expressed in the saying that the invisible things of Him are perceived through the things that are made.[4] But so far as man is concerned, he is said to be made in God's image, and hence one thing covered by this similarity is the fact that man too is, *qua* man, buried in his external form, as God is to us in His world.

This truth is experimentally found to be true by the profound dissatisfaction which we all feel with our actual selves. Were it not for this imprisoned Deity mankind might have been expected, after these thousands of years of search, to find a way in which it might so adjust itself to its environment as to secure that happiness which most

[1] Heb. i. 3.
[2] Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, p. 85.
[3] 2 Cor. v. 17, Gal. vi. 15.
[4] Rom. i. 20.

moralists agree in defining as one end of all action. But the fact is asserted on every side and by all sorts and conditions of men that that happiness has not been found, and cannot be gained by any skill of man, that always something is lacking, some kill-joy is there, that at the best happiness is but an aching longing for what the heart sees and strives after but cannot attain. It is always

> The little more, and how much it is!
> And the little less, and what worlds away![1]

The reason surely is that God made our heart for Himself, and it is restless till it finds its rest in Him. It is

> The Desire of the moth for the star,
> Of the night for the morrow,
> The devotion to something afar
> From the sphere of our sorrow.[2]

The same truth, though not necessary indeed to establish man's freedom, is at all events that which brings it home to him most nearly and most effectually. For his freedom does not consist in a mere indifferency of choice, or even in a power to choose what he may happen to like, still less in a power to transcend his limits as a creature, but solely and simply in the power of self-determination for the purpose of God for him as expressed in his nature. Being placed, as he is, midway between God within and the world without, his Ego being through sin no longer operative in its true home, the spirit, but only now in the spirit's organ, the soul, he feels in unequal measure a double attraction, that of God above and that of the world below. To surrender

[1] R. Browning, "By the Fireside," st. 39.
[2] P. B. Shelley, "To ——."

to the latter is to set up a process which all the more thoroughly degrades and enslaves himself; yet how is he to escape from bondage, *i.e.* how recover his lost freedom? That consists, as we have just said, in the uniting of his will with God's, that God's purpose may be fulfilled in him. And the inner experience of all saints, and of most of us, is that from the abysmal depths of personality there come to the surface "groanings which cannot be uttered," "fallings from us, vanishings; blank misgivings of a Creature moving about in worlds not realised." Whence come these fugitive voices, which are as yet too gentle to compel obedience, and yet are too persistently haunting, too much akin to our highest moods, to be neglected? The answer of Religion is that they are echoes from our far-off home, herald-voices of our future bliss, and reminders that, in spite of all, we are even now partakers of the Divine Nature. God is crucified, God is buried in us because God is love.

The same tale is told by conscience. It is surely a gratuitous belittling of the sovereign worth of conscience to say with Fr. Delitzsch that it "is not an echo or abode of an immediate divine self-attestation, but an active consciousness of a divine law established in man's heart," and it is no sufficient qualification of this depreciation to add that "the testimony of conscience certainly rests on a divine foundation woven in our natural condition, *scil.* on a divine law in man, ordained with his created constitution, the existence of which, its claims and judgments, are removed from his subjective control." [1] But how impossible it is for any writer to separate God's law from God's presence appears

[1] Delitzsch, *Biblical Archaeology*, p. 165.

from a spontaneous remark elsewhere of Delitzsch himself that "God the triune dwells omnipotent in every created thing." [1] Add to this a quotation he gives from Harless: "The unity of the foundation of all things suggests a homogeneity of the things with one another, and thus is assured the possibility of their substantive reciprocal action," [2] and it becomes still more evident that the immanence of God, not merely in conscience but in all things, is an inevitable conclusion of the reason. For if there be in all things an underlying unity, that unity must be found not in the variety of forms which differ, nor in manifestations of life which vary, but in life itself, that is, in God, from whom proceed all life and all substance. Nor can this Life be regarded as an Idea floating in Infinity or *in vacuo*, but as the concrete Reality which from the richness of its content makes everything to be what it is, and so gives the world its infinite variety. Moreover, the attempt to account for the "categorical imperative" of conscience by a divinely implanted law, leaving the Giver of the law as a merely transcendent, external force, is shattered on the truth that wherever a thing acts there it is.[3] The place where a thing is is always inferred from what it does, and how; and if, therefore, God utters a law in the conscience, in the conscience God is, buried it may be, yet indubitably there, even though entombed and imprisoned. "I feel it impossible," says Newman, "to believe in my own existence (and of that fact I am quite sure) without believing also in Him who lives as a Personal, All-seeing, All-judging Being in my Conscience." [4] Here the burial of God in

[1] Delitzsch, *Biblical Archaeology*, p. 226.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 260 *n.*
[3] Lotze, *Microcosmus*, i. 293.
[4] *Apol.* iv. 2.

the spirit made in His likeness is parallel to the burial of that same spirit of man in his corporeity. The two are inseparable.

(*c*) *The Burial of the Old Man.*—The tables are turned, and we have now to record a burial of another order of worth, though with equal reality, if of unequal extension. The burial of the Old Man by the power of the Christ seems to be the very antithesis and contradictory of the burial of God in His world or of the burial of man's spirit in his body. Yet if we look at it from the reverse side we shall see that it is equally admissible to speak of the burial of the New Man or of the burial of the Christ Himself. Indeed it would be better to dwell on the positive side of the process of which the burial of the Old Man is the negative. For just as the thought of God's immanence in the world transfigures the world to him whose eyes are open, just as the recognition of the presence of God in man's spirit dignifies man in his own eyes, so the regenerated man may be strengthened and illuminated by the knowledge, if only he hold it fast, that concealed in his spirit, buried in it, not latent or dormant, but rather active as a struggling Titan, inspiring, healing, sanctifying, is the Christ Himself. This glorious truth is obscured by the constant reminders we receive of our sinfulness, by the abiding feeling of our guilt, but nevertheless these should not be allowed to blot out of consciousness the celestial truth that our conversation is in heaven, *i.e.* with the Christ who dwells in the Holy of Holies of our spirits. Indeed, it would be but the expression of a deep Christian truth if we said that the one sin which is peculiarly anti-Christian is that of a refusal, or even of a neglect, to recognise

the New Man within, buried indeed but preparing to rise to fulness of life.[1]

The New Man of Eph. iv. 24, Col. iii. 10, is a new creation,[2] and, therefore, the sepulchre in which Jesus was laid was a new sepulchre "wherein was never man laid,"[3] and hence the song of the redeemed is a new song.[4] Yet the New Man is not yet completely risen,[5] for he is as yet "being made new"[6] with a view to the attainment of the gnosis which comes of faith, and in order that he may some day attain to the image of his Creator, *i.e.* to the image of the God-man, who in the last analysis of the inner constitution of man is the "hidden man of the heart,"[7] or the hidden wisdom of God.[8] Meanwhile, this New Man, though buried partly under the God-provided forms of existence here, partly under the débris of the temple that sin has laid low, yet is growing, and energising more and more, and gradually taking possession of the temple of the Holy Ghost which is being rebuilded through suffering, crucifixion, and death.

[1] In the Fourth Gospel particularly sin is regarded as non-recognition of the Light of the Christ; cf. ix. 41, xv. 22, 24, xvi. 8, 9, and also the numerous references to the "truth," the truth being that of the indwelling of God. The inevitable consequence of this blindness to man's true centre was the establishment of a false centre. In other words, Egoism replaced Love.

[2] 1 Cor. v. 7, 2 Cor. v. 17, Gal. vi. 15.

[3] John xix. 41.

[4] Rev. v. 9, xiv. 3, Ps. xxxiii. 3, xl. 3, xcvi. 1.

[5] Outside the Gospels the burial of Christ is referred to four times only in the N.T., viz. in Acts xiii. 29, 1 Cor. xv. 4, Rom. vi. 4, Col. ii. 12. The two last passages refer to the symbolism of baptism which says in act that the initiate has been buried to the Old Man and raised to the New Man in Christ, which is to be explained on the principle that God calleth things which are in the germ only as though they were already in the ripeness He foresees for them (Rom. iv. 17).

[6] Col. iii. 10. [7] 1 Peter iii. 4. [8] 1 Cor. ii. 7.

CHAPTER XIII

THE FIFTH ARTICLE

He descended into Hell

("Descendit ad Inferos")

Though Christ's descent into Hades was a Christian belief of the first century it was not given any place in the Creed till after the opening of the fifth century: who inserted the article, or when, or why, is uncertain.[1] It may be the expression of a desire for historical completeness, or of the poetic imagination which loved to play on the unknown, or of a theological exactitude. In any case, the starting-point of any interpretation must be the Burial of Christ, and its forward reference must be to the Resurrection. We have yet to see the mystical connection of the Descent into Hades with the Resurrection, and we must not forget this connection, but it should not be difficult to see how the Descent is linked on to the burial.

The Descent into Hades is the consummation of the Incarnation, for in this the Eternal Word,

[1] "The purpose of its insertion in the creed we do not know. It was perhaps intended to emphasise the completeness of Christ's death over against the subtle docetism of the third and fourth centuries, which had resulted from the spread of the Logos christology, and which tended to confine the human nature of Christ to his material body, and so take away from his death all spiritual significance" (McGiffert, *Apostles' Creed*, p. 31).

united to the archetypal man, descended into this under-world and tabernacled in our human nature, as the Shekinah in the Jewish tent where God met His people. In so condescending He took on Him the full conditions of human nature and its capacities both for achievement and for suffering. Foremost among the sufferings to which He became liable were the confusion into which man's complex nature had been thrown, and his consequent impotence, wandering out of the Way, and chronic sense of defeat. It is conceivable, abstractly considered, that God as a *Deus ex machina* might have abolished this confusion of death and all its consequences by an act of His will, but it is not conceivable that He would or could do so in the case of beings to whom He had given in potentiality the supreme gift of Personality, with its property of self-determination. For though all things are possible to the counsel of God's will *simpliciter*, yet when once that Will has been set in motion, then nothing is possible which could contradict that Will. To think otherwise is to deny the Perfection of God. Hence it follows that if man was to be regenerated the process of regeneration must respect God's gift of freedom, and must not, therefore, put constraint on him from without but persuade him from within. But no conceivable way of doing this is possible except that which God has actually adopted, viz. the Incarnation in the length and breadth and depth and height of its marvellous condescension.

It may be objected, before the Descent into Hades is stated in terms of spiritual life, that that descent is purely and simply historical, and is nothing but the fulfilment of every human experi-

ence during the first five minutes after physical death. Without denying this latter assertion it is enough to say that the burden of proof is on him who uses the phrase "nothing but." Is anything in the world from the highest to the lowest just its isolated self, out of all relation to every object, with one separate and independent set of activities which concern nothing but itself? Or is the world a *cosmos*, an ordered whole, in which every single, mean and common thing is knit into close connection with all others, so that wherever and whenever any action takes place the ripple of it affects every other member of the *cosmos*, whether near or at the furthest boundaries of space? Philosophy has no hesitation in replying in the affirmative to the latter question.

The objection, however, is levelled not so much against any particular interpretation of any particular article of belief as against the principle of *Analogy* in general, which is the same as saying that it is levelled against religious knowledge in general, *i.e.* against Theology. Following Dr. Westcott,[1] we say that man has a spiritual faculty which, unless paralysed by sin, gives us intuitively an immediate consciousness of God, and that without the exercise of this faculty God remains for us an outer fact instead of an inner truth, but that when once the faculty has been allowed fair-play we are able to turn round on our world of experience and reinterpret it by the light of truth revealed by this faculty. The system of truth so attained is what is called Theology.[2] But what is not so often observed is that the method of Theology is the

[1] *Gospel of Life*, 1892.

[2] See Caldecott, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 315.

method of *Analogy*. "Religion," says Darmesteter, "embraces all knowledge and all power which is not scientific. The unity of this vast field of the unknowable comes from that unique force which is the source of its fertility and the great mother of myth and rite—Analogy." [1] Theology "proceeds to form a fresh world-view; namely, a symbolism whereby all things are σημεῖα, manifesting to us the way of God, and intelligible in a new way when so regarded." [2] This is to say that Theology, building on its mystical apprehension of God as Self-existing, infinite, personal, perfect, immanent and transcendent, or any of these, rearranges its experiences of the phenomenal world under its mystical categories, and treats the objects of its knowledge as graded reflections of the Divine attributes. Hence what is true of one set of objects becomes by analogy true of another, according as it is nearer to the centre or further from it. This may be illustrated by drawing a set of concentric circles and cutting them with a common radius; the point at which this radius cuts each circumference is analogous to every similar point on the circumference of the remaining circles. Or if the Theology be a terraced pyramid, what is true on each terrace is true analogously on all.

If we say then that Christ descended into Hades as being a member of the physical order, then the law of Analogy and the necessary procedure of Theology, both under the guidance of the mystical intuition, require that we should extend this consummation of physical death to a similar consummation on other planes of living. For the Hermetic axiom, "As above so below," is regulative of all Theology.

[1] *Revue phil.*, January 1882, t. xiii. p. 76. [2] Caldecott, *l.c.* p. 316.

A. Death is essentially the dissolution of the complex and the resolution of its elements. This is expressed when the psychical and the physical were separated in Christ by the statement that "He descended into Hades." But this is not the fatal separation He had in some mysterious way to face and to overcome. If in Him our full humanity, ideal and actual, our earthly as well as our heavenly, was recapitulated,[1] then He was familiar with our lowest as well as our highest. In some sense even sin entered like iron into His soul. As microbes attack the body from within, though not a part of it, while cancer is said to be a growth out of the tissue itself, so we may say that sin, as a foreign body attacking the Personality within, was known to the Redeemer, and that for the very reason that it was thus brought so near to His holiness He experienced its horror more than we ever do, or at present can.

His "Descent into Hades" began then when His Divine Personality was assailed through His humanity by the sinister power of Egoism. And the very sting and bitterness of this Egoism consist in this, that it is a caricature of a most profound truth, the truth that God is the one real Ego of which man's ego is a type and analogue.[2] Man's Ego, therefore, can remain sound and loyal only so long as it keeps its subordinate place as a likeness and an organ of the one Divine Ego, and the lie that was from the beginning is that which has persuaded the dependent and created ego that it could

[1] Eph. i. 10.

[2] "In the proper sense of the word, Personality—*für-sich-sein*—can be predicated only of the Infinite . . . what we call personality, selfhood in man, is but the dimmest shadow, the faintest effluence from the source and fount of Being, in whom alone is perfect Reason, perfect Will" (W. S. Lilly, *The Great Enigma*, 1892, p. 241). See also below, Chapter XXIII.

profitably set up for itself and disregard the law of cosmic harmony. A question well put is already half-answered, and when the question is, "Yea, hath God said?"[1] the answer in act is not far to seek. It is a cheap and fruitless amusement to jibe at the naïve story of the Fall, but when that story is stripped of its literalness and interpreted by the law of Analogy it will be seen to be a profound presentation of the essential character of man's age-long sin. For this is nothing less than the cleaving of a great gulf between the Eternal Ego and the created ego—and it could hardly succeed in being anything more. To this is to be traced back all the misery of man, his impotence, failure, and broken happiness.

Into this Death Jesus Christ descended by bringing His Divine Personality into full conflict with the egoistic impulse of fallen human nature, and from this conflict waged against Him by this separative and dissolvent power He emerged victorious.

B. But the Ego of man, *i.e.* the spark of the Divine fire in man, is not a fourth function of his spirit (the three being his higher knowledge, will, and feeling); nor is it an isolated and superior entity hovering above man's spirit, soul, and body. It is rather the synthetic unity of the whole being, the ground of which is in the spirit, the organ in the soul, and the manifestation in the body. The Ego, or the Personality, is, as it were, the living heart of the man, and while this heart beats in unison with the Divine, man the three-in-one on earth enjoys the life, light, and love of God, the three-in-one in heaven. But when the lower ego starts

[1] Gen. iii. 1.

aside from the higher Ego the curse of separation and διάλυσις fastens on it as a whole, and on each part of it.

Hence death attacks not only the ego but also the spirit. Spirit, indeed, cannot be dissolved because it is not compounded, nor can it be annihilated, for that would write failure against God, but it can suffer the darkening of its eye, the paralysing of its will, and the deadening of its sensations. It can pluck itself by its own choice out of the power of love and submit instead to the "mind of the flesh which is enmity against God," [1] and introduce confusion and discord into the palace of the Great King. Retaining the two characteristic glories of the Person, self-consciousness and self-determination, it yet can rob these of what makes their bliss, their living contact with the Eternal Person, and their loving conformity to His will. "E la sua voluntate è nostra pace." [2] Sin, or Egoism, has brought about a dissolution of partnership, as it were, and ever since experience has proved more and more conclusively that the independence, or separation of men from God, involves a dissolution or breaking up of even the spiritual life, which is the second stage of the death which slowly creeps downwards until it lays hold of every element of man's being.

Into this Hades also did Jesus Christ descend, and by maintaining intact the union of His human spirit with His Divine Personality, He established for those He is not ashamed to call His brethren [3] a fountain of living waters springing up into aeonian life.[4]

[1] Rom. viii. 7.
[2] Dante, *Paradiso*, iii. 85.
[3] Heb. ii. 11.
[4] John iv. 14.

C. But once more, as the Ego of man is not by nature separable from his spirit, so neither are they both from his soul. "The Lord God," says Gen. ii. 7, "formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." First the body was formed, then into the body is breathed the spirit (n'shamah), and, lastly, there becomes the soul as the organ of the life of the spirit. And just as the spirit of man is made in the likeness of God, so is the soul made in the likeness of the spirit, the Trinity which God is reappearing in reflected form in both Man's spirit and in his soul. Moreover, just as God though three in person is one and undivided in His essence, so is man, His image and likeness, one and undivided also. Hence if disorder creep in and find lodging in any part of his being, the whole is affected. If his spirit retain its communion with the Father of Spirits, both soul and body remain sound and sweet; if, on the other hand, the spirit loses its connection with God, both soul and body in their turn suffer from the wrong choice made by the spirit. This is precisely what has happened to man's soul, the glory of his spirit. It has left the straight Way of Life and wandered as a prodigal son into a far-off country where no news of the Father's house comes to its forgetfulness of its origin and place and destiny. It is dead even while it has the name to live, dead in the sense that its sense of its heavenly life is atrophied, and so its threefold being is thrown into confusion; it neither knows as it ought, nor wills what is right, nor feels the goodness and beauty lying within it and around it. Dissolution and the apathy of death have made it their own.

Jesus Christ then descended into the hidden depths of the Soul, and shared its death by sympathy and beneficence as He did its life by becoming incarnate. Had He not so descended, had He, that is, contented Himself with taking a human soul in its ideal state of perfection, untouched by sin, and hence not in the state of dissolution and discord known as death, He might have been a philosopher, or a great Teacher, but hardly a Saviour, a Redeemer.

D. Lastly, we come to the physical death which Jesus descended into. We must, however, be careful not to limit this to the final separation of soul and body which is commonly called death, but extend the operation of the force there triumphant to the whole period of the connection of soul and body. For in a real sense it is true that as soon as we are born we begin to die, and of this the going astray and speaking lies[1] is one piece of evidence. But ill-health and the gradual wasting away of physical vigour with increasing years afford another, though perhaps a less cogent proof of the same process. For as a matter of fact, though death was in the world of vegetable and animal life from the beginning and, therefore, before the appearance of man, yet if the Bible view of man be followed, death would not have had any power over man at all had he but remained loyal to the design which placed him in the garden of his threefold nature to dress it and to keep it.[2] As Jesus when He became man was put in the position of *posse non peccare*, and by a life which was the antithesis of Adam's attained the position of *non posse peccare*, so Adam was placed in the position of *posse non*

[1] Ps. lviii. 3. [2] Gen. ii. 15.

mori that thence might follow *non posse mori.* Hence the Biblical antithesis between Eve who sinned and Mary who gave herself to be God's handmaid, between the garden of Eden where Egoism prevailed and the garden of Gethsemane where Egoism was conquered,[1] between the first Adam, a living soul, and the second Adam, a life-giving spirit. Sin entered into the world and death by sin,[2] and this death attaches to the whole man, to his Ego, his spirit, his soul, and his body, for it is the breaking up of his divinely-ordained complex constitution.

When, however, death attacks the body, whether throughout life, or at the last assault, it acts by withdrawing from it the living forces of the soul. And these follow the soul as this is indrawn into the spirit from which it emanates. Hence the difference between the death of a man and of a mere animal consists in the fact that when the latter dies its soul goes back to the reservoir of life from which it came, while man, who has been given a higher ground of individuality in that into him has been breathed the spirit of life,[3] sinks back, not into nothingness, but into the unconsciousness from which he emerged at physical birth—to re-emerge, as reincarnationists hold, at a later birth to resume his lessons in the school of earthly life.[4]

[1] It is significant that it is the "mystical Gospel" alone which tells us that the "place" was a garden; cf. Matt. xxvi. 36 with John xviii. 1.

[2] Rom. v. 12. [3] Gen. ii. 7. נְשָׁמָה חַיִּים.

[4] Delitzsch, who argues for traducianism against creationism (*Biblical Psychology*, p. 128 ff.), and condemns whole-heartedly metempsychosis (p. 548), yet holds that reincarnation is "not in itself repugnant to reason" (p. 43), though it is "absolutely contrary to canonical scripture" (p. 44). It is all the more significant, therefore, to find him unconsciously opening the door for it in the words: "In view of the personality which distinguishes the human soul from the brute soul, annihilation or remanation of

Another fact, to which every physician can bring testimony, is that physical death is frequently, perhaps ordinarily, the result of a death-process which has been already established in the soul. Where the diagnosis writes down thrombosis, shock, nervous collapse, anaemia, heart-failure, the psycho-therapist might more truly write down soul-withdrawal. More people die because they have ceased to wish to live than is generally recognised. Hence a more searching therapeutic will probe the maladies of the soul as the key to the diseases of the body.[1]

That Jesus Christ descended into the Hades of physical suffering and death, is attested by His works as physician of the bodies of men as well as of their souls, and is pointed to in the text which tells us that His healing work was continued after His physical departure in that like Enoch He went and preached to the spirits in prison.[2] Whether in the visible or in the invisible world Jesus Christ, as God our Redeemer, never ceases, never has failed, and will ever continue to pursue His healing work on spirit, soul, and body by Himself descending to the realm where Death, the great dissolver of what God has ideally joined together, holds sway.

---

the former is assuredly an idea of extreme improbability. For personal freedom is the inexhaustible ground of possibility of an endless development; and it is extremely improbable that this development, in its origin, or broken off in its middle, and the fulness of substance which the human soul has attained by means of free life, should be forcibly extinguished" (p. 475). If life's lessons are broken off in the middle, half-learned, which is more probable that God should have to devise another school, or that the lessons should be resumed here?

[1] This is being done with increased thoroughness by the Nancy School and by Freud and his disciples. Cf. my article, "Faith-healing," in Hastings' *Ency. of Rel. and Ethics*, 1912.

[2] 1 Peter iii. 19; cf. Rendel Harris, *Expositor*, November 1901, where he suggests that the nominative case, Enoch, has dropped out of the text.

CHAPTER XIV

THE FIFTH ARTICLE (*continued*)

The third day He rose again

Τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν

JESUS is said to have risen on the "third day," or after "three days."[1] The variation in the phrase is hardly to be accounted for by reference to local usage, or to a difference of translation from the Aramaic (though Mark always uses ἀνίστημι, and always says "after three days"), for Luke uses both verbs, and Matthew both reckonings of time. It points (if we are concerned with pure history) to an uncertain tradition, or (if we are seeking mystical truth) to a hidden mystery;[2] and this latter must be sought in what is common to both forms, viz. the number *three*.

That a half-apologetic tone comes easy to any writer who hazards a suggestion that in the Bible use of numbers there lurks a hidden symbolism affords a striking testimony to the decay of a spiritual interpretation of scripture, and to a

[1] "On the third day" occurs in connection with the resurrection ten times in the N.T., viz. in Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 23, xx. 19, xxvii. 64, Luke ix. 22, xviii. 33, xxiv. 7, 21, 46, and 1 Cor. xv. 4; "After three days" in Matt. xxvii. 63, Mark viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 34. The verb used in eight of these passages is ἐγείρω and in five ἀνίστημι.

[2] Cf. Rev. i. 20, xvii. 5, 7.

corresponding growth of rationalistic. A grammar, a lexicon, and a history are no doubt valuable aids to the interpretation of the Bible, but they are as a microscope to a blind man unless they are used by the man whose spiritual eye is opened to judge of the value of what reason offers. It is here, however, assumed that such a symbolism exists in the Bible, and that it will repay the search for it, but if any object to such an assumption, though he may lose much, he can hardly be blamed in view of the extravagances of those who have submitted themselves to the fascinations of the symbolism of numbers. What, therefore, is said here will be strictly limited by the necessities of the case, and by the generally-admitted truths of the Bible.

The number *three* is the signature of Divinity and denotes the presence, power, or activity of God in His world. The three days of the Egyptian cook and cup-bearer were significant of God's judgment ; [1] the three days' journey were that God might be worshipped ; [2] during the three days' darkness God was hidden ; [3] three days were reserved before the Israelites found God in the Land of Promise,[4] and the spies hid themselves from God's enemies three days ; [5] Saul found his asses and God after three days ; [6] God sent a three days' pestilence upon Israel ; [7] when God had taken Elijah the prophets sought for him three days ; [8] Jonah was three days in the psychical world before he found the shore of the spiritual ; [9] the multitude were with Jesus three days before He fed them ; [10]

[1] Gen. xl. 12, 18. [2] Ex. iii. 18. [3] Ex. x. 22.
[4] Joshua i. 11. [5] Joshua ii. 22. [6] 1 Sam. ix. 20.
[7] 2 Sam. xxiv. 13. [8] 2 Kings ii. 17. [9] Jonah i. 17.
[10] Matt. xv. 32.

Jesus was found in His Father's temple after three days,[1] and Saul spent three days alone after his conversion.[2] In all these and similar Biblical notices of the number three, a little reflection will show that what is signified is that the threefold thing mentioned bears the mark of the Divine.

So in the Resurrection-history the space of three days, or the time which came on the third day, is put under the signature of three to say to those who have ears to hear that the work of Resurrection is the work of God. This is only saying in symbolical manner what Romans i. 4 says scholastically, when it states that Jesus Christ had a twofold history; on one side He entered the world of Becoming through the gateway of the seed of David, that being the way of His flesh or phenomenal manifestation; on the other side He was marked off as the Son of God distinct from all others by the power of God, having passed through the gateway of resurrection out of the world of the dead, that being the way into the spirit-world of holiness. The ascription of the work to God is insisted on in order that nobody should let himself suppose that when he turns from darkness to light he may claim any merit in the operation, seeing that he may read some five-and-twenty times in his N.T. that even Jesus was raised up by God the Father.

Nor should we pass over without a word of comment the difference of meaning between the two verbs used to denote the act of resurrection—ἐγείρω and ἀνίστημι. The former is the more common word in the N.T.[3] and points to the

[1] Luke ii. 46. [2] Acts ix. 9.

[3] It is used of Jesus Christ forty-nine times, and its ordinary complement is ἐκ νεκρῶν.

transcendency of God's operation, while the latter (which is the word of St. Mark and our Creed) favours the immanent power by which the Divine in Christ Jesus raised Him from the dead.[1] Perhaps the word was chosen designedly to emphasise the spiritual process in the Human Nature itself—and therefore in ours. For the στάσις of any creature is its internal nature, its status, that which makes it to be what it is, the being in all its fulness which it has received as its Idea from its Creator. The *stasis* of an animal differs from that of a plant and both from that of a man, and so long as anything retains its natural *stasis* no blame attaches to it. But the Bible consistently represents man as having suffered a κατάστασις, through sin, a fall, or a failure to stand fast in the position he was placed in. Following this line of thought, the στάσις which constituted the Divine Idea of man, having given way to a κατάστασις, the root of which may be defined as man's false idea of God, it was necessary, unless the Divine Idea of man was to suffer defeat, that an ἀνάστασις should come to redress the balance. And it is precisely this which is the subject-matter of the Bible and of the Creed.

The restriction of the doctrine of the Resurrection to that of a literal reanimation of the corpse has been responsible for a disquieting amount of unbelief in the honesty or spiritual insight of the Church. The immortality of man has been based on the physical resurrection of Jesus Christ, with the direst consequences to faith and hope, and in

[1] McGiffert points out (*Apostles' Creed*, p. 133) that "the third day" does not occur between N.T. times and the emergence of the Roman Symbol except in Justin Martyr (five times), and then always with ἀνίστημι. So far as Justin therefore, and the Creed go, the immanent aspect is brought to the fore.

spite of the better example of the Fathers. "The soul," says Tatian, "is not in itself immortal, O ye Greeks." So Justin Martyr, "It participates in life, so far as God wills it to live." And Athanasius, "God alone has immortality, and is Himself immortality." So the N.T. says that God "alone hath immortality," [1] and says of Jesus Christ that He has "shed light on life and immortality." [2] In the face of such statements we must conclude that if our human nature now possesses in its Head or members immortality, then it must be a derived immortality, one that has been bestowed on it, and not one that it possesses in its own right. So that if immortality be our present privilege *anastasis* is not merely the restoration of our original *stasis*, but imports that, *plus* the end into which God intended it to develop.

Again, if immortality be a bestowed gift, since it cannot be any extra endowment, such as a new unrelated attribute would be, it follows that it must depend on the possession of a life, substance, or status of which it is a natural consequence. And this seems what is meant in 2 Peter i. 4, where it is said that through certain great and precious promises we may become sharers of the Divine Nature. The promises referred to are attached to such things as virtue, temperance, and knowledge, and give the assurance of an entrance into the aeonian kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.[3] Entry into that kingdom then is the condition of being made sharers of the Divine Nature. But to enter into that kingdom means on our side taking up the Cross which kills Egoism and substitutes Love in its place, and on God's

[1] 1 Tim. vi. 16. [2] 2 Tim. i. 10. [3] 2 Peter i. 11.

side the gift of the New Life through Regeneration. So that immortality on the authority of the N.T. itself is a human prerogative which follows on a *prius*, viz. on the impartation of something of the Divine Nature itself, *i.e.* of something which by its very nature is deathless.

This view is supported by the consideration that no being is self-existing except God, and that therefore none can enjoy existence apart from His support. This support may be regarded as given once for all at the beginning, much as we wind up a clock and expect it to go until the force stored up by winding is exhausted; or it may be regarded as a force supplied moment by moment, like gravity or cohesion or chemical affinity which acts continuously. Although modern philosophy is agreed that the whole phenomenal world is under the sway of innate mechanical law, yet it does not say that this is the *only* system it obeys. Teleology is as universal as mechanism. Man is a machine no doubt, but he is also more than a machine, and it is in that more that his true nature is found.

But whether machine or organism, it is clear that the second alternative must be chosen, and that in either case man (as everything else) is the product, moment by moment, of the force put forth by God, or, in other words, creation and maintenance in being are really one and the same process. God wills, God speaks, God breathes, express it how we may, we mean in any case that God's power is put forth continuously, and so His world, and all in it, obtains continuous existence. He may put forth His power in such a way as to give an existence that is brief, such as that of the insects of a day, or an existence that though longer is still brief,

such as that of animal life in general. Or, on the other hand, He may, for aught we know, give a life which persists through aeons, and then passes away into some other form. Or, finally, He may impart something of Himself (I speak as a fool) which carries with it the attribute of immortality. And this Something it is which Christianity testifies to. It declares that the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Jesus Christ issue in a life of immortality by Divine necessity, because they are moments in a process of which the deification of man is the purpose.

But unless we are to delude ourselves with phrases we must make it clear to our own mind that this Immortality, in the first place, is no inherent attribute of man as man, for this is contradicted by every text in the Bible which emphasises the sin and death and wrath under which man suffers.

In the second place, we must be clear that Immortality in the sense of an endless continuance of this earthly life of ours is not taught by Scripture, is no part of the Christian doctrine, and is contradictory of reason, while at the same time, if given, it would be a dubious boon. Not the quantity of life, but its quality is what determines its worth.

In the third place, Immortality is not a quality which can be added to a mortal life either directly or arbitrarily. God cannot make an insect, nor indeed any animal, immortal without contradicting Himself. Nor can He, similarly, bestow Immortality on mortal man without contradicting Himself.

In the fourth place, Immortality cannot be imputed, but must be imparted. This is the reason why the physical resurrection of Jesus *in itself* can

have no relation to our Immortality, nor indeed, if we isolate even such a resurrection as His from all its implicits, should we be justified in deducing from it the consequence of Immortality. For it is precisely in these implicits that the secret lies. Because He was the Eternal Word in the form of man; because in Him dwelt all the pleroma of the Divine nature embodied;[1] because He interfused the Divine Nature as a *φάρμακον ἀθανασίας* into the nature of Adam; or, if the phrase be preferred, because He united indissolubly the Divine Nature to the human in Himself as its preservative and quickening partner; because, in short, there was implicit in His Resurrection what He was; Death had no more dominion over Him.

In the last place, if we are to share His Immortality there must take place in us a similar union of the Divine and human. He must, as we know He will and does, give us of His flesh to eat, and of His blood to drink in a living and heavenly sense, of which the gift in the Eucharist is an outstanding type and an effectual means.[2] For unless we abide in Him and He abide in us, in the literal sense of a common participation in the higher life, then we still remain, and shall continue to remain, under the sentence of death. In some way, the life which was in Him must be also in us, if we are to share His immortality.

It is these considerations which should make us cautious before we stake the saving power of our religion on the *bare* historical, or physical, resurrec-

[1] Col. ii. 9.

[2] "The only sure anchor of all our hope for a joyful resurrection unto the life of glory is the mystical union which must be wrought here on earth betwixt Christ's human nature glorified and our mortal or dissoluble nature" (Thomas Jackson, *Comment. upon the Apostles' Creed*, 1673, p. 436).

tion of Jesus Christ. That His Resurrection is indeed the keystone of Christianity is indubitable, and it is represented with perfect clearness as such in 1 Cor. xv. 12-18. Only it is to be noted that it is not His physical resurrection as such which is there spoken of, for if it were the conclusion would not follow from the premisses. This is clear from the declaration that if Christ be not raised, faith, confidence, trust has no basis, and sins remain unforgiven. But how can faith in the physical resurrection by itself secure the forgiveness of sins? The man who believed in it as a fact might hope that the God who had raised Jesus would at some time also raise him, but where could he find the link between the two? Has "belief in that which is credible" any religious value? and if we answer that question in the negative, are we not driven to seek for some deeper ground such as that which finds an eternal principle, an everlasting gospel given bodily form in the resurrection? In that case we shall conclude that the resurrection spoken of in the passage referred to is one which belongs to the inner world of Reality before it emerges into the outer world of history, which is the same as saying that if Jesus Christ had not risen through the indwelling power of His Divinity out of the condition of man as liable to sin and death there would be no guarantee, or even hope, that we, so infinitely less endowed, would rise out of actual sin and actual death within and without into the life of the New Man, the life which is hid with Christ in God. That Christ is a living Person influencing each of His followers for good by the power of God, and giving them no rest until the Old Man in them is dead and the New Man alive, is the foundation

of the hope of our Immortality. But not history alone, nor belief by itself, is the ground of that hope, but the present possession of the new life through being born from above, through regeneration, new-birth, conversion, the acquisition of the so-called cosmic-consciousness, or (better) God-consciousness, it is (and this through the immediate act of God) which is the pledge in hand of Immortality.

Here there may be stated the objection that if what has just been said is a true account of the Christian gospel, then all that it offers is a "conditional immortality," which is tantamount to saying that there are few that are saved. Without entering a demurrer that labels and set formulae should not be allowed to be put in, since they are the deadliest enemies of honest thinking, it should be enough to enquire as to the reason for saying that the doctrine of the New-birth involves that of conditional immortality. If it be replied that it is only a small minority, if ordinary observation may be trusted, in each generation who are conscious of the experience of being born again, we may put two questions by way of rejoinder. Firstly, does not experience, as well as the analogy, say of thought-life and plant-life, assure us that Life for the most part works in silence and darkness, and that, therefore, the process which eventuates in regeneration is operative long before it comes to consciousness? and, secondly, what warrant is there for maintaining the negative thesis that this present incarnation of ours is the only one allowed us? Just as Voltaire said that if there were not a God, man would have to invent one,—which was his witty way of describing Anselm's well-known

proposition,—so we may say that if there is no evidence for repeated lives in this or some other body we must find some, for otherwise life as we know it in its higher reaches remains an insoluble problem. Once it is admitted that the "wheel of generation" of James iii. 6 brings in the due order of its revolutions every soul in its appointed time to the New-birth, and then the taunt of "conditional immortality" falls of itself with most other intellectual difficulties which are raised by spiritual life. Nor can it be admitted that this doctrine of many lives in the body is unknown to Holy Scripture, for the contrary proposition may be fairly maintained, viz. that the doctrine of re-incarnation (or re-embodiment) lies at the ground of the whole view of salvation as set out in the Bible, as the necessary truth which gives coherence to the whole.

Indeed it may be urged that if it be granted that the Manhood taken by the Eternal Logos at the Incarnation of Jesus Christ was not created *ad hoc*, nor derived in its entirety by the way of traducianism, but had been prepared through the long and purifying process of many lives, as Phil. ii. 5-11 suggests,[1] then the crowning act of the Resurrection shines forth in far greater lustre than it can on any other hypothesis. Its height is all the more venerable because of the increased labour and suffering which must be undergone before it can be scaled. It is no isolated experience of the God-man, but in Him it is the exemplary form of the Resurrection which awaits every man in his turn and order. It comes, too, as the final act of a long drama in which every word and every action played

[1] See p. 107, above.

their appropriate part, and find their significant meaning.

When all this is seen clearly and assimilated thoroughly we shall be in a better position for appreciating the vital importance of the part played by the body in the resurrection of Jesus Christ and in our own. But it will be better to defer the consideration of this to the time when we deal with the article in the Creed, " I believe in the resurrection of the body."

CHAPTER XV

THE FIFTH ARTICLE (*continued*)

The third day He rose again (*continued*)

So far we have said nothing of a positive character about the nature of the Risen Life itself, because it seemed necessary first to vindicate the majesty of that Life as the bearer of Immortality from the neglect it has suffered at the hands of the majority. Of course it is not easy to define in words, or even to formulate in thought what that Life in itself is, any more than the fourth dimension can be stated in terms of the lower three. Indeed no definition is attempted in the N.T.—probably because the unhappy need for definitions had not yet risen. St. Thomas Aquinas, indeed, does find certain characteristics of the resurrection-body, such as subtlety, brightness, agility, and incorruptibility in the statements about it in 1 Cor. xv.,[1] but these do not reach to the native home of the Life itself in the spiritual world. But what the N.T. does do, in a way which must extort at once our wonder and our thankfulness, is to set out in a series of symbolic stories the main characteristics of the Risen Life. It is hardly too much to say that the failure of scholars to give any harmony of the ten resurrection-

[1] *Com. in D. Pauli epp.* in loco.

stories on grounds of reason or history is a matter to rejoice over. For their failure suggests a mistaken point of departure, and invites us to try another. Such another is offered by Mysticism. We will endeavour then to point out by the examination of a few of these stories the light they throw on the Risen Life. But first three general characteristics of it may be noted: the characteristic of mystery, and of love and of service.

1. *The Mystery of the Risen Life.*—It is not without reason that it was before dawn that the two Maries went to see the sepulchre,[1] or just at dawn;[2] or at early dawn,[3] or "early,"[4] that Jesus rose early;[5] that it was toward evening when He was recognised at Emmaus;[6] or evening when He appeared in the upper-room;[7] or at break of day on the sea-shore.[8] For the implication in all these passages is that while man works and walks by the light of Reason during the twelve hours of the light of this world,[9] yet there is another state of consciousness called the "Night" in which a man stumbles if he attempts to walk by the light of Reason, and not by the heavenly light belonging to this higher state. What this higher state of consciousness is may be illustrated by that lower state we call sub-conscious.[10] This, apparently, is the sum-total of all our memories and acquired psychical habits, and is bound up with the sympathetic nervous-system as its physical correlate. It is related to our ordinary waking-consciousness

[1] Matt. xxviii. 1. [2] Mark xvi. 2. [3] Luke xxiv. 1.
[4] John xx. 1. [5] Πρωί, Mark xvi. 9. [6] Luke xxiv. 29.
[7] John xx. 19. [8] John xxi. 4. [9] John xi. 9.
[10] One fundamental difference between super-consciousness and sub-consciousness is that the latter is habitual, *i.e.* mechanical, while the ormer is consciousness in free relation with a higher Power.

as the stars to the sun—when one sets the others rise and *vice versa*, and is cognate to the consciousness we have in sleep, whether dreamy or deep. As everybody knows, the difficulty is not in ascertaining that we are subjects of these two states of consciousness, but rather in linking one on to the other. Between the two a thick curtain seems to hang, and this is seldom lifted on either side.[1]

Similarly, the Risen Life transcends ordinary consciousness, so far as this latter depends on the stimuli of the external world. The man of naïve sensationalism regards this external world as purely objective, and is unaware of any subjective relationship to it; the morbid mind, on the other hand, forgets the objectivity of thought and mingles confusedly subject and object, until at last it is unable to distinguish them, and is overtaken by madness. Ordinarily, however, the man whose eyes are opened learns that he must keep the balance true between the vision of the external world and the vision of the world within. He knows both, and at first alternates them, but gradually he comes to know that the two are one at bottom, that not only is the soul spiritual but so also is the world, and so he sees the outer world transfigured by the glory of the inner world. Yet the mystery of this latter is never lifted, and, if anything, experience of it serves only to heighten the mystery of the outer. The child of both is wonder which rises into worship.

2. *The Risen Life as Love.*—We have seen that Crucifixion in its essence is the doing to death of

[1] On this whole subject see Carl du Prel, *Philosophy of Mysticism*, trans. by C. C. Massey.

the life of Egoism, from which it follows that the Resurrection is the triumph of the life of Love. And this appears from the fact that when the risen Lord appears it is for the good of the person He appears to: He is not so much sought for; He appears autonomously, whether to the women, to Thomas, to the eleven, or to Peter. It is not merely that every one is given precisely what he needs, but rather the first significant feature of each story is the spontaneous action of Jesus Himself. It is true that the mystery which now enshrouds Him makes it difficult for the disciples to recognise Him, but the wonder of His actions is not different from the wonder of those earlier actions which consisted in His going about doing good.[1] For both proceeded from the same spirit of love. The chief difference is that then He was limited by the physical conditions of His human nature, but now those limitations have been removed. He can act when and where, and as He pleases, and what pleases Him is what springs out of Love.

3. *The Risen Life as a Life of Service.*—It is also worthy our notice that to whomever Jesus appears to them He gives directions to go and do something for others. His angel tells the two Maries to "go quickly and tell His disciples"; [2] Jesus Himself orders them to go tell His brethren,[3] and particularly in the elaborate threefold commission to Peter does He insist on service. This is precisely what might have been expected on the assumption that the essence of the Resurrection is the triumph of the Life of Love over the Life of Egoism, for the

[1] Acts x. 38. [2] Matt. xxviii. 7, Mark xvi. 7.
[3] Matt. xxviii. 10, John xx. 17.

joyful service of others is the very outward embodiment and form of the Life of Love.

There is a reason for this in the nature of things, if we may use an interesting analogy insisted on by the late Professor W. James in his *Will to Believe*. He points out that in a bodily act there are three stages, first the impression made from without on a nerve-fibre, then the reaction at a nerve-centre, and finally a motor impulse which starts muscular activity. Similarly, he says, psychologically we have a perception, thought about what is perceived, and then an act of Will (in which Feeling is included). We may apply this analogy to the Risen Life itself by saying that there is first an appeal made to the heart of love by the very presence of a human being, then an inner judgment as to ways and means of helping, and then a definite act of service. This applies too to the Mary, or Peter, or whoever it may be who meets the Christ. The heart is touched, thought, memory, imagination are quickened, and finally the whole inner being breaks out in an act of service. When God appeared to Abraham by the oaks of Mamre the result was Abraham's supplication for Sodom ; [1] when He was seen by Moses in the bush it was to send him to Pharaoh ; [2] when He came to Joshua as captain of the Lord's host He bade him go and take Jericho ; [3] He took David from the sheep-folds that he might feed Jacob His people ; [4] the word of the Lord that came to the prophets invariably had action for its end ; [5] Isaiah's vision ended in " go and tell this people " ; [6] and Saul's first command at his conversion was to

[1] Gen. xviii.
[2] Exod. iii. 10.
[3] Joshua vi. 2.
[4] Ps. lxxviii. 70.
[5] *E.g.* 1 Kings xviii. 1, xix. 15, etc.
[6] Isa. vi. 9.

go to Damascus and await his orders.[1] It is a small but significant confirmation of this law when we find the late Dr. Westcott, whose whole thought was dominated by the truths of the Incarnation and the Resurrection, emphasising repeatedly the "joy of service," even as St. Paul puts joy among the fruits of the spirit next after love.

We may now take one or two of the Resurrection-stories in some detail with the view of showing how the nature of the Risen Life is illustrated by them.

A. *The Risen Life and the Life of Enquiry* (Luke xxiv. 13 ff.).—The two disciples going to Emmaus are—like the two spies,[2] the two men in the camp,[3] the two olive-trees of Zech. iv. 3, the two disciples sent by Jesus,[4] the two men sent to Peter[5]—the two forces of Wisdom and Love which are continually engaged in preparing the way of the Lord. Their goal is Emmaus, where are the springs of living water.[6] As they go along the road of life they reason anxiously about the enigma of Evil, and state (as does the author of Pss. xlix. and lxxiii. and of the book of Job) their perplexity at seeing the wicked triumphant and the good oppressed. Their perplexity is, if anything, increased by the dim hopes and forebodings they feel within, which are stirred up by feminine intuitions, and confirmed by stories of angels' visits. They would fain believe, but their reason is not convinced, and their reason is not convinced because their inner eyes are holden so that they cannot see the Truth in that clearness which carries conviction—"das Klar ist das Wahr."

[1] Acts ix. 6.
[2] Joshua ii. 1.
[3] Num. xi. 26.
[4] Mark xi. 1.
[5] Acts ix. 38.
[6] Cp. חַמָּה, *Hammath*, hot spring.

They were familiar with their Scriptures, but the mystical meaning of them was as yet not opened, and this for the sufficient reason that they had approached them only from the side of reason. Their difficulties were due to the fact that they were applying Reason to a range of phenomena which were beyond Reason, that they treated their Scriptures, as we treat ours, from the evidential side only, and hence fail to get at their true meaning. This lies open to the eye of faith enlightened by love.[1]

But Christ is the living King of Love, and He knows how to shed abroad His love in our hearts[2] through the Holy Ghost, and when He has done this we learn that the Way of Life is the Way of the Cross, that through death alone we enter into life, and that, therefore, evil men who thwart, injure, and torment us are all unconsciously instruments in our hands if only we have grace to use them. It behoves the Christ and every Christian to suffer before he enters into his glory, and suffering requires personal agents for its infliction. This comes home to our hearts as a practical truth, honestly and whole-heartedly accepted, only when the Christ within reveals it to us, as He accompanies us on our Pilgrim-way towards the village of eternal life. Is it fanciful to see in the κώμη,[3] the village, or resting-place, the state of the soul when it has left the phenomenal world and is at " home "

[1] As Dante says of " la pena che la croce porse " :

" Questo decreto, frate, sta sepulto
agli occhi di ciascuno, il cui ingegno
nella fiamma d' amor non è adulto."
Par. vii. 58-60.

[2] Rom. v. 5.

[3] From the same root as κεῖμαι ; cf. our *home*, Ger. *Heim*, and the suffix *ham* in place-names.

in the world of Reality ?[1] Then Jesus *abides* (the word is technical, and is opposed to *becomes*, as μένω to γίγνομαι) with the soul now opened to the inner world, and He breaks for it the bread of life which fills the heart with the joy of complete satisfaction. Then the eye within is opened completely, and by the gnosis of faith (ἐπίγνωσις) they recognise the Unknown Companion, who, however, passes beyond their capacity of vision,[2] leaving them, as it is said the Initiates in the ancient Mysteries were left, with nothing they could tell, inasmuch as what they had seen was symbolical of things deeper than thought. All that they could say was that their hearts burned within them. The Christ by His Risen Life had shown them the way to transcend Reason and to overcome its doubts by Faith.

B. *The Risen Life and Penitence* (John xx. 11-18). —The "tomb" (μνημεῖον) in which Jesus is hidden is the Church which has been builded on His death. It is His "monument," that which bears testimony to Him, and serves as a solemn call to men to pause and consider their relation and duty to Him. Among those who are attached to that Church, and in their hearts are devoted to its Lord, are the class of life-long penitents in whom has been aroused more powerfully than in most the sense of sin. The type of these is Mary Magdalene, of whom it was recorded that Jesus had cast out of her seven devils,[3] that is, that He had healed her soul of all the diseases of sin by which she was afflicted. The Fourth Evangelist, as his manner is, takes up this

[1] Cant. v. 2.

[2] So Dante again : "Si come il sol, che si cela egli stessi per troppa luce" (*Par.* v. 133).

[3] Mark xvi. 9, Luke viii. 2.

record and makes it the base of one of his symbolic stories. To him Mary Magdalene becomes the type of the soul which has found healing, but not joy or peace. Therefore she stands in her mental attitude outside the Church, much as the *poenitentes* were compelled to do in the early days, and bemoans her past sins, heedful no doubt of the stern fact that though sin may be forgiven, yet that the soul must endure the limitations imposed by sin on it in loss of delicacy of feeling, spontaneousness of love, and capacity of self-surrender.

The first step towards sharing in the Risen Life is taken when the soul steps aside [1] from brooding on its condition, and looks instead humbly at the "monument" left behind Him by Jesus. The Evangelist seems to emphasise by his choice of words the necessity for humility as a precondition of the mystic vision, and we may expand his demand by saying that when the experience of sin has taught its bitter lessons the soul attains to a midway position of Disinterestedness towards the things it once desired, and is ready to pass from this to that humility which is the fruit of the vision of Goodness. If it be said here that to include the Supreme Good in a representation is to compel Him to enter the empirical world, we reply that man is a member of the higher world of Freedom in so far as he sees the Good, and that, therefore, the act by which he sees is not of the empirical order, does not make use of a representation, but is an act of the spirit which only afterwards becomes through self-expression a member of the empirical world.[2]

[1] Παρέκυψεν.

[2] This in opposition to Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason.*

On man's side then humility is the counterpart to the gift of God. For when it stoops it beholds, with the interest and delight of a spectator at the games, the presence of the Divine in the Church which is—to employ a kindred metaphor—the body of Christ.[1] For the two angels in white are the surrogate of Jesus Himself, even as the angel of Jahweh in the O.T. was of Jahweh. They are clothed in white, for white is the colour of light, and the Logos is the Light of the world, and God dwells in light.[2] They sit one at the head and one at the feet, as the angels of memory and of hope. They question the penitent, *i.e.* they cause her to put explicitly before her mind the cause of her sorrow, in obedience to the law which says that confession is good for the soul. She makes a formal confession of her desolate state in turning her mind on her past,[3] and then the revelation flashes on her that through the whole period of her egoistic life Jesus had been standing at the door of her soul knocking[4]—that every inmost inspiration had been His angel undefiled—and she had not known that it was He.

Even now she is unable to recognise His voice, so difficult is it for the soul to escape from the preconceptions and the timidities and the despond-

[1] Eph. i. 23.

[2] 1 Tim. vi. 16, James i. 17, Acts xxvi. 13 ; but God is also fire (Heb. xii. 29), that is, in the presence of righteousness He shows Himself as the light of love, but in the presence of sin as the fire of wrath—to consume not the sinner but his sin.

[3] The phrase *εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω* must be rendered, as the similar phrase in Phil. iii. 13, of things of the mind and not of locality. Cf. the address of the Shepherd to Hermas (*Sim.* ix. 2, 7) : *τὰ ὀπίσω σου ἰδεῖν οὐ δυνῇ τὰ δὲ ἔμπροσθέν σου βλέπεις* ; Luke xvii. 31, John vi. 66, xviii. 6, in all of which a deeper interpretation renders " the things behind " as lower stages of the spiritual life.

[4] Rev. iii. 20.

encies which form her *damnosa haereditas* of sin. With memories of the past flooding in, the keeper of the garden, Satan, the Lord of temptation and of Form, seems to be the speaker as of yore, questioning her for trial and not to draw her to the central fire of love. If so, she hardly stands the test, for no matter how great her love, she still emphasises her feeling that she is capable by herself of appropriating Him, that is, His salvation, if once she knows where to look for Him. This is on a lower level than that suggested by the first address of Jesus to her in which He salutes her as " Woman," as He had before addressed the Syro-phoenician woman of great faith,[1] His Mother at Cana[2] and at the Cross.[3] In each case the implication is that " Woman " represents the intuitive, receptive, expectant attitude which stands over against the Christ offering to Him the chalice of the soul to be filled with the wine of spiritual life. The higher judgment contained in the words, " Woman, why weepest thou ? " is a call such as God is wont to address to our souls to make ourselves worthy of the position thus offered, and Mary's reply is typical of our inability as a rule to make an adequate response.

It is not till the invitation is still more intimately phrased, until it takes a distinctly personal character in the naming of her name, Mary,[4] until the name is named by God Himself so as to touch the hidden springs of personality that the trust in self (" I will take Him away ") is transmuted into the spontaneous self-surrender implied in the term of adoration, " Rabboni," which is expressed in the language of

[1] Matt. xv. 28. [2] John ii. 4.
[3] John xix. 26 [4] Cf. Exod. xxxiii. 12, 17.

the heart. And even this is not the final term, for the personal bond of affection must in its turn yield to a still more deeply-rooted tie. The personal must become the super-personal, and the human Friend and Teacher must be seen as the ascended Lord (hence the injunction, "Touch me not"), as the vicegerent of the Father, before the eternal bond of union, the heavenly marriage, can be established between God and the soul.

Meanwhile, the *feeling* expressed in "Rabboni," the *thought* which is to assimilate the transcendency of the risen Lord, are to find expression in the act of service for other disciples. She who has been shown the inner truth is to go out and tell others that the revelation which Jesus makes of Himself, and in their degree, therefore, of His disciples, is that their life consists in a continuous process of ascending towards His God and Father and theirs.

The story taken as a whole, therefore, is a revelation of the effective operation of the Lord through His Risen Life in the soul, whereby He calls it out of sin to penitence, from penitence to humility, and from humility to recognition of Him as Lord of the soul, and of itself as His servant and missionary.

C. *The Risen Life and Contemplation.*—The full mystic meaning of the story in John xx. 19-23 may be best obtained by regarding the social event there described as a reflection from the personal life of a representative Christian, following the numerous indications of the N.T. which point to Christ as the inner principle of the spirit of man.[1] Such a

[1] In this case the "disciples" represent the summation of the powers of the soul—Judas, a representative of the Tempter-side of Nature being significantly absent from the Life which is now on a plane where Tempta-

Christian obeys the command, " When thou prayest enter thy innermost chamber " ; [1] he withdraws his mind, that is, from all thoughts and feelings that are concerned with outward things, he gives pause even to the unending " discourse of reason " that fills waking life, he inhibits all inner movements that are personal in origin or content, and with all his spiritual powers in active repose he waits to see what God will say to him. He has learned the lesson which Moses taught at the Red Sea, " Stand still and see the salvation of the Lord " ; [2] and the Psalmist, " O tarry thou the Lord's leisure ; be strong and He shall comfort thy heart, and put thou thy trust in the Lord " ; [3] and Isaiah, " In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength," [4] the lesson which modern philosophy has missed, and the modern industrial system scoffs at, viz. that man's part is a small part compared to God's, for all that he has to do is to make ready a highway for God, and then to wait for God to come when and as He pleases. The denial of this fundamental truth of religion is the one and only heresy of this, or of any age, which is of any importance.

In the Gospel-story before us, however, the lesson has been learned, for the Christian soul has shut to the doors of its soul lest any Jews, that is, external persons, things or ideas, should enter, and so shut out God. And he has his reward in that

---

tion cannot come. This twelvefold enumeration (when Matthias replaces Judas) of the powers of the empirical Christian reappears in the Apocalypse in the description of the holy city, the heavenly Man, the perfect cube, where no part was wanting and none in excess. (The symbolism of the four sides and the three gates in each has been ingeniously worked out by Anna Kingsford in *The Perfect Way*, 1890, Appendix V., and by St. Bernard in Migne, t. 184, 1117 ff.)

[1] Matt. vi. 6. [2] Exod. xiv. 13. [3] Ps. xxvii. 16. [4] xxx. 15.

Jesus, that is, God in His redeeming (=exalting, inspiring, and attractive) power, in His own way, suddenly emerges out of the deepest ground of Being and moves forward into the foreground or central point of the innermost, where "mortal and immortal merge and human dies divine." Moreover, He appears as the antithesis of the spirit which is always Becoming, the spirit which the Christian soul has been stilling into silence. He is instead "He who stands, stood and will stand," the fixed centre of a world in ceaseless motion, and as such He fills the soul with an ineffable satisfaction; His salutation is an effectual gift of Peace ("Peace be with you"), for the voice of the Lord is mighty in operation.[1]

The showing of His hands and His side is the assertion of the profound psychological fact that the wounds caused by our sins with which the indwelling Christ is daily wounded in the house of His friends[2] are by a Divine alchemy changed into dazzling rubies in His heavenly crown. It is true in the mechanical world of which we are subjects that no act, good or bad, but leaves its mark on our psychical substance and endures in our memory, but that is only one-half of the truth. The other half is even more important, and that is, that in the heavenly world of Freedom these records of the empirical world undergo a change into something rich and rare, so that what began in shame ends in glory. The Christ, who has been made bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, now shows His pierced hands and opened side, not in reproach, but as dazzling memorials of a Divine love now clad in deathless beauty. This vision of rhythmic

[1] Ps. xxix. 4. [2] Zech. xiii. 6.

beauty, of sadness now vibrating in the major-key of joy, fills the whole being with rejoicing, for it is the joy of the Lord Christ in whom the twelvefold powers of the soul find their unifying point.

Again, the gift of peace comes in double measure (*v.* 21) seeing that there is this difference between earth and heaven, viz. that on earth all pleasure ends in satiety and in longing for something which is not pleasure, while in heaven happiness never cloys, but is ever fresh. This at least is what those mystics and saints who have found the heaven of the inner kingdom of God affirm with one voice, and their testimony on a matter of spiritual fact is as credible as that of a scientist about a bacillus.

As we have seen, whenever a man is brought face to face with the Risen Life he is called on for service, not for inglorious ease. The Christ was sent from the Father in order that He might minister to others,[1] and He in His turn sends His servants forth on the same errand, clothed with the same authority. "As my Father hath sent Me, even so send I you"; *hath sent*, and therefore sends still, for the Father is working still, and so the Christ is an unceasing worker also.[2] Moreover, He who sends the worker supplies him with strength. As the Lord God formed man's body and then breathed into it the breath of life, so Jesus by a similar mode of working breathes into every soul which receives Him of His own Divine spirit of love and holiness. Henceforward such souls are as a light shining in a dark place, as a city set on a hill, or, to use a well-known image, they become sun-like in that they harden some as clay and melt others as wax. Their influence on sinners automatically provokes

[1] Mark x. 45. [2] John v. 17.

hostility, and so retains the sins which that influence stirs into activity ; their influence on those who have begun to hate their sins melts them into penitence and desire and love, and so remits, or forgives, or puts away the accursed thing.

Again we see that the characters of autonomy, of activity, of love, and of authority of the Risen Life are illustrated in the way that it crowns of its own volition the efforts of Contemplatives to find it, by pouring upon them of the Spirit they are in search of, and then by commanding them peremptorily to go forth as agents of the redeeming Lord Himself.

D. *The Risen Life and the Understanding.*—The story of Thomas in John xx. 24-29 need not detain us long, for from one point of view it is an appendix to the foregoing, and from another is a double of the story of the Two Disciples going to Emmaus. But Thomas is a typical figure with a character all its own. It will die for the faith it has but not go beyond it. What others may tell it listens to without conviction, and demands a proof all to itself. It is inclined, therefore, to minimise the social side of religion and the forces in human nature which drive it towards fellowship with others, and to omit the argument from the *consensus gentium* altogether. You must prove it to me in black and white, is its demand ; I must see and feel for myself ; I must ask that a direct and recognisable stimulus be applied to my own personality in its memory of its wounds, before I can surrender myself in confident trust on Another.

This demand Jesus meets in the power of His Risen Life. He appears to Thomas, shows him that He knows his inner mind without enquiry,

as He had once shown Nathanael,[1] and so wins an equally whole-hearted surrender. On which there follows the Beatitude which is the unfailing encouragement of those who press forward unfalteringly towards the higher life without proofs or sensible signs of God's presence, but in simple, childlike, unquestioning certainty that God is, and has a right to claim full obedience. Many are those who have had no clear inner vision, who have heard no voice within, such as Elijah heard at Mount Horeb, or Jesus at Jordan, or the Three on the Mount of Transfiguration, but yet push forward bravely and persistently, doing their best, wishing it were better, and then leaving the rest to God.

> Glad souls without reproach or blot
> Who do Thy will and know it not

are as much subjects of this Beatitude as those who honestly and perseveringly try to do it, and succeed partially only. Certainly the man who obeys a clear inward call, such as comes to a Thomas, is blessed indeed, but what we should not have noticed, unless the Lord of Life had drawn our special attention to the fact, is that those are more blessed who commit themselves to Him unhesitatingly without demanding signs or proofs. Which should be a consolation to ordinary Christians when they encounter persons who tender proofs based on psychic gifts, or experiences of the sweetness of God to the soul.

E. *The Risen Life and Eternal Life* (John xxi.).—The transcendent life which is the goal of all manifestation of immanent life here below is nowhere set forth with more penetration and skill than in

[1] John i. 48.

the last chapter of the Fourth Gospel. Seven disciples go a-fishing. Seven is the number which denotes the manifestation of a higher Being. Thus the seven spirits of God who themselves fill the Universe are the manifestation of God in His glory. The sevenfold powers of the soul are the outward and visible manifestation of the spirit of man, and similarly the seven disciples are the manifold radiating divine-human powers by which the Christ reveals Himself in the world of souls, typified by the Sea of Tiberias. His work, carried on by the powers of the souls in which He has incarnated Himself, is to fish, as He, the Great Fisherman, had been doing throughout the ages for the souls of men. Oftentimes His agents go forth to their work left apparently to their own devices, with no heavenly light to help them, and all that "night" they catch nothing. This apparently is to warn us off all confidence in ourselves, our independent action, or in our natural or acquired capacities. Then failure drives us to our Lord right humbly, and we find Him there all the time standing on the shore of eternity. He inspires us so that we cast our nets on the right side of the ship—an important law of mission-work. His gospel is not to be thrown to the four winds blindly in the hope that somewhere some of it will find lodgment, but only where there are prepared souls ready for it. Did He not Himself say something about not giving that which is holy unto the dogs and not casting pearls before swine [1] even as Ezekiel (xlvii. 10), writing of the same great fishing of souls, said that "from Engedi even unto En-eglaim shall be a place for the spreading of nets; their fish shall be after their kinds, as

[1] Matt. vii. 6.

the fish of the great sea, exceeding many " ? The right side of the ship is dedicated to those fortunate souls who find themselves, like fishes in the waters, brought under God's hand to the solemn moment when, after much moral and mental struggle, they are ready for the New-birth into the Eternal World.[1]

It is the Disciple who was loved, and therefore himself was filled with love, who first discerned the Wonder-worker, but it was Peter, the man of the intuitive Faith which goes straight to its object, who found easily the suitable form for his impetuous rush through the intervening distance which separated him from his Master.[2] But no soul goes alone and on its own quest. It is accompanied by its companions, and so there is brought to Jesus all the souls that have been fished out of the psychical world for Him.

On the eternal shore Jesus stands ready to receive His own and what He has to give them is Himself, for He is the Fish lying on the fire—Piscis assus Christus passus—purified seven times by fire, as He is the Bread of Life. The number of the " great fishes," *i.e.* of great souls—great because of

[1] May we not deduce from this passage the inference that Buddhism and Mohammedanism and all lower religions have their subordinate place as preparing their devotees for the coming of the Christ to the soul, and that He may come under the forms provided by any one of these, even without any assistance from a definitely organised Christian body ?

[2] Two hundred cubits, like the two hundred pennies of John vi. 7, the two hundred pomegranates on the temple pillars, Abigail's two hundred loaves and cakes of figs (1 Sam. xxv. 18), all seem to symbolise by their *hundreds* (=ten squared) completeness, and by *two* the world of duality, so that two hundred cubits of sea-journey typify the sum-total of experiences which the soul in its appointed clothing of flesh (ἐπενδύτην) must go through in this world where all things are double one against another (Ecclus. xlii. 24) before it reaches the eternal world where duality is lost in unity.

the great tribulations out of which they have come, —is a hundred and fifty and three.[1]

The invitation to the morning-feast, the silent awe of the disciples, the hush, that is, that falls over all the subsidiary powers of the soul in the consciousness of the presence of Christ, the giving of the food of immortality by the risen Lord, are described in a few broad strong touches so as to leave on the mind of the reader an impression of the supernatural unearthly character of the story as a whole. We are left with a feeling of awe in the presence of one among us who is the Lord of the invisible world as well as of the visible.

In giving the above interpretations, however, of the Resurrection stories, we are far from wishing to have it supposed that these interpretations exhaust the meaning of the stories, or give more than a single aspect of each story. They are finger-posts pointing to the direction in which the meaning is to be sought and in a way shadowing it out, but not claiming to be the meaning in its fulness of breadth and depth. The presupposition of their treatment as given above is that the stories proceed from masters of the spiritual life, and that they

[1] St. Augustine and St. Gregory both symbolise this number, and we may take it for certain that they are following the same tradition which the Fourth Evangelist also followed. St. Cyril of Alexandria regards 153 as $100+50+3$. The 100 is the fulness of the Gentiles, the 50, being half of 100, is "the remnant of Israel according to election," and the 3 is the all-governing Trinity. St. Augustine offers us two interpretations. The 3 stands for the Trinity and 150 is 50×3; but 50 is the square of $7+1$, and represents the perfection of the sevenfold working of the Holy Spirit brought to a unity. Or otherwise: 153 is the sum of the first seventeen natural numbers. But 17 is $10+7$; hence 153 represents the sum-total of all those who keep the Law (10) by the power of the Spirit (7). St. Gregory takes 17 as St. Augustine does for those who keep the Law through the Spirit, multiplies it by 3 to get the jubilee number with *one* added, for rest, and by 3 again, which gives us 153, or the number of the citizens of the heavenly country who have found final rest.

share, therefore, in the inexhaustible depth of that life. The well is deep, and all our vessels are inadequate taken together to empty. Each must do what he can and draw what he may. But when once the mystical or spiritual nature of the stories is recognised, all controversy about their meaning becomes impertinent. For truth can never give contradictions but only complementary aspects.

CHAPTER XVI

THE SIXTH ARTICLE—PART I

He ascended into Heaven

Ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς

THAT the Ascension of Jesus has been from the very first as integral a part of the story of His earthly life as His Resurrection is certain,[1] and this in spite of the fact that it too is not marked by definiteness of time. The Acts place it forty days after the Resurrection, Barnabas (xv. 9) on the same day, and by Valentinians and Ophites it was placed eighteen months afterwards, according to *Ascension of Isaiah* 545 days afterwards, and according to the *Pistis Sophia* eleven years later. But this variation of date does not affect the undoubted testimony to the fact any more than difficulties in harmonising the appearances after the Resurrection throw doubt on the belief that Jesus Christ had risen from the dead.

[1] This is only in appearance contradicted by Harnack when he says that the narration of Christ's descent into hell and ascent into heaven rose comparatively late, for he dates them even so from the close of the first century and derives them from short formulae (such as those of the Creed) "containing an antithesis . . . *descensus de coelo, ascensus in coelum: ascensus in coelum, descensus ad inferna*, which appeared to be required by O.T. predictions . . . just as it is still naïvely inferred: if Christ rose bodily he must also have ascended bodily (visibly?) into heaven" (*History of Dogma*, i. 106).

But our concern here is with the meaning of the Ascension rather than with the Ascension itself as a historical fact, and the meaning seems to be suggested by two passages, one from the N.T. and one from St. Augustine. In Eph. iv. 9 it is said that the reference to Ascension in Ps. lxviii. 18 imports a previous descent into the lower parts of the earth, where the reference is to the Incarnation and not to the Descent into Hades as a distinct act.[1] So St. Augustine says that the Ascension is the counterpart of the Incarnation, for in the one Jesus came out of the invisible world into the visible, and in the other he returned from the visible world into the invisible.[2]

It is clear, however, that the two are not like a *plus* and *minus* which cancel one the other, for at the Ascension something was taken into the invisible which had not come out of it at the Incarnation, unless it may be in germ. For Phil. ii. 9 says that since the Christ humbled Himself at His Incarnation, *therefore* God also hyper-exalted Him (ὑπερύψωσε), and freely gave Him a Name above every name. That is, His earthly doings and sufferings were not mere empty examples for others without vital relation to Himself, not mere surplusage

[1] The genitive in the phrase " lower parts of the earth " is not partitive but epexegetical. It is the earth itself to which the Christ descended. The same meaning is to be found in John xii. 32 (*v.* 33 is a misleading gloss), where Jesus speaks of Himself as being raised out of the earth, *i.e.* out of His earthly and mortal body. Rom. x. 7 is not contradictory of this, for there the " abyss " takes the place of the " earth."

[2] This is paralleled in *En. in Pss.*, Ps. xxxviii., Bened. ed., iv. 309 : " Est autem haec ascensio [of the Psalm heading] non pedibus, non scalis, non pennis ; et tamen si interiorem hominem intendas, et pedibus et scalis et pennis. . . . Sed in rebus corporalibus aliud sunt pedes, aliud scalae, aliud pennae. Intus autem et pedes et scalae et pennae affectus sunt bonae voluntatis." But the Ascension of Christ receives very little notice from St. Augustine.

which might have been omitted without leaving His inner life the poorer, but actual achievements which in some way enriched His human spirit and soul, and, *therefore*, gained for Him His hyper-exaltation. He Himself affords the best commentary on His maxim that he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.[1]

We must not allow ourselves, however, to adopt the easy and ready explanation that this conquest and subsequent exaltation are to be explained as inevitable seeing that His humanity was indissolubly united to the Eternal Word, and, therefore, could not but be carried aloft, for this is to deny to His human Will that noblest prerogative of man, the power to exercise his freedom to choose God as his portion. The difficulty this explanation raises is not got rid of, be it noted, by any reference to the newness of the human nature taken by the Incarnate Lord, for if this new humanity was such that it was beyond the reach of Freedom, then it lacked, we must say again, the most distinguishing characteristic of human nature, and so a gulf was dug between Him and us. On the supposition, however, that One had pre-existed as man, who as man had achieved all that was within the attainment of man, who as man had surrendered His personality utterly and entirely to God, so that it was able to be assumed by the Eternal Logos, our difficulties disappear. Freedom is respected, necessity is obeyed, the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation is made more convincing than ever, and in particular the famous passage Phil. ii. 5-11 gains a fuller meed of homage and a more satisfactory interpretation than it commonly receives.

[1] Matt. xxiii. 12.

The Gnostics as the first Christian theologians [1] attempted to apply to Christian belief in Jesus as God the categories of syncretistic thought. In doing this they explained that in His descent He had clothed Himself in each of the successive heavens He passed through with the form proper to it, and so had escaped the notice of the aeon, or archon, who ruled over it, including the "prince of the power of the air." [2] The day has gone by for treating Gnosticism as speculation run mad, in spite of the *Pistis Sophia*. For the *Hymn of the Soul* has revealed the fact that among the Gnostics, as among ourselves, was a left wing which used the phraseology of their school as the bearer of their mystic experiences, and a right wing which thought that their theology was an adequate expression of Reality. The former, we may conjecture with some confidence, meant by the descent through the

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, Eng. trans.: The Gnostics "were, in short, the Theologians of the first century. They were the first to transform Christianity into a system of doctrines (dogmas). They were the first to work up tradition systematically. They undertook to present Christianity as the absolute religion, and therefore placed it in definite opposition to the other religions, even to Judaism. But to them the absolute religion, viewed in its contents, was identical with the result of the philosophy of religion for which the support of a revelation was to be sought" (i. 227). Gnosticism was the eclectic system of religious thought and practice which was in possession of the lands round Palestine at the beginning of our era. It is defined in *Excerp. Theod.* lxxviii.: "What sets us free," says the Valentinian, "is the knowledge of who we were, what we are become; where we were, whither we are come for our bodily life (ἐνεβλήθημεν); whither we are hasting, from whence we may attain redemption; what birth is and what re-birth." The problem of Evil, *unde malum*? especially occupied Gnosticism, and according to Anz its central teaching was concerned with the way by which the soul could escape from the slavery of the powers of Space and Time (aeons) and mount beyond all planetary influences into the highest heaven where is the blessed freedom of the Divine Pleroma. (See *Realency. f. prot. Theol. u. Kirche*, vi. 731; and W. Anz, "Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus, 1897," *Texte u. Unter.*, Band xv. Heft 4.)

[2] Eph. ii. 2.

various heavens and the taking of a different form in each, the series of steps by which Jesus assumed every part of our nature, spirit, soul, and body. Indeed the single fact that Gnosticism throughout its whole extent admitted the analogy of the macrocosm and the microcosm would be alone sufficient warrant for inferring that the " descent into the lower parts of the earth " is a descent into not merely our spirit on its divine side but into the uttermost depths whether of spirit, soul, or body, which are to be found in human nature. It is immaterial whether we adopt the threefold or sevenfold division of the heavens—the Gnostics as a rule favoured the sevenfold, and St. Paul in 2 Cor. xii. 2 the threefold division, for in both cases the essential meaning is the same, viz. that of all the states of consciousness, or of being, that are proper to man, Jesus was a participator. Moreover it is clear that the word *heaven* or *heavens* in the N.T. has passed beyond all spatial conceptions, and denotes that state of life which is in accordance with the Being of God—the life of love, joy, and peace.

It is of some importance to emphasise in the Christian's Creed the implicit assertion of his descent from above, both in the way of the natural and the supernatural, seeing how strong a bias a one-sided statement of the principle of evolution has given in the popular mind to the materialistic explanation of the origin of man. No one who has given even a slight attention to the facts of the ascent of man physically from lower forms, as evidenced, for example, in phylogenetic embryology, will wish to throw doubt on man's kinship with the lower animal world. But at the same time

no one who considers the mental and spiritual heights to which man may rise, nay, has risen, can be content with any merely physical explanation of his origin. On the form side undoubtedly an ascent may be charted, but on the side of life a descent is marked with equal clearness. Man, as an animal, is under the law of evolution, but, as man, his true home is in the realm of heavenly Freedom. He too has descended into the lower parts of the earth, and also his destiny is to ascend into the third heaven whence he came.

It would be easy to draw out on the lines of scientific method a spiritual itinerary of man in his descent. Such an itinerary would be concerned to show how from the Idea which proceeded from God man as spiritual being started on his career; how his early stages were marked by self-consciousness and self-determination; how next the spirit obeyed the law of self-formulation by putting forth as its image and glory the Soul; how the Soul learned of its Spirit to perceive and create sensation, to feel, to know, and to will; how to Soul was added Body as the expression of the Spirit in "ultimates," and as the instrument, and also the limiting law of the Spirit's activities. Then we might, still following established lines, retrace the Spirit's path as it turns round on itself to seek the Idea from which it took its rise; and then, finally, we might, if we had full confidence in the all-embracing sweep of Reason, utilise the scheme so constructed to illustrate the meaning of the Ascension of Jesus Christ. And when we had done all this we should find ourselves somewhat further from the Truth than when we started.

For Religion has her own truths, her own logic, and her own instruments, which not only include those of Reason, but supply the very light by which Reason walks. To Religion Thought is not the last term of the spirit but the middle term between Feeling and Will. By the tendency of the Will as directed by Feeling in front and by Thought following after is the value of man's life decided, and the earthly life of Jesus Himself submitted to the same process of testing and judging. It was not the depth of His feeling, or the unerring aim of His intuition, or the extent of His acquired knowledge which fitted Him to be the Redeemer of men, but the unswerving devotion of His Will to the Will of His Father in Heaven. Whatever came to Him as meat, whether of earth or whether it proceeded out of the mouth of God, was used to fulfil the will of His Father and to finish His work.[1] Moreover this was not a sporadic obedience and devotion, but unbroken throughout life, so that at the end He was able to cry triumphantly, "At last it has been finished, the testing is over, the candidate has passed every trial, obedience has been proved to the uttermost, the spirit of Egoism has directed his last assault, Love has conquered." Then by no arbitrary decree, but through the very nature of things, He arose from mortality to immortality, ascended where He was before, not merely as Christ but also as Jesus—the Name that is now above every name.

It is inadmissible to press the grammar of the classical period as regulative of Hellenistic Greek in face of the many evidences of the process of detrition which has been at work on the latter,

[1] John iv. 34.

but on the other hand it is hazardous to pass over all peculiarities by a reference to that process. On the assumption, which we hope we have shown is not without some ground, that Christianity is primarily mystical, we should be on the look-out for grammatical peculiarities, and when we come across them should enquire whether they are intentional, and if they are intentional what is the reason. One peculiarity occurs frequently in the N.T., especially in the Fourth Gospel, viz. the use of the present tense where the future would be not unnatural.[1] This occurs in connection with the Ascension in John xx. 17, which relates that Jesus said to Mary Magdalene, "I am ascending"; in John xvi. 28, "I am leaving the world and I am journeying to the Father," where the change of tense from the preceding, "I came forth out of the Father and I have come into the world," is remarkable. So the new Jerusalem is said in Rev. iii. 12 to be the city "which is coming down out of heaven." "The hour is coming," Jesus tells the Samaritan woman;[2] similarly to His disciples, "the hour is coming and has come";[3] and "he that is coming to Me";[4] "the night is coming";[5] and the people shouted, "Blessed in the name of the Lord is the Coming-one."[6] Akin to this is the frequent use of the aorist in a gnomic or universal sense, *e.g.* in John iii. 33, xv. 6.[7]

[1] See note on p. 292 below.

[2] John iv. 21.

[3] John xvi. 32.

[4] John vi. 35, 37, 45.

[5] John ix. 4.

[6] John xii. 13, Mark xi. 9, Luke xiii. 35, xix. 38. Cf. John iii. 31.

[7] Blass's remark, *Gram. of N.T. Greek*, p. 194, that "this usage is very rare in the N.T., and only found in comparisons or in connection with comparisons," is true only of the Gospels when all but the literal sense is excluded. It is specially untrue of the Fourth Gospel.

The result of these and numerous other passages of a similar kind is to emphasise a process rather than to narrate an event, and this, as we have seen, is one note of a mystical outlook. Its relation to the Article of the Creed before us is obvious. It declares that when we have come to know of the Ascension as an event we must proceed to study it as a process. And when we do this we secure what Thought demands—that the particular shall show itself under the category of the universal, or in default be dismissed as a "dead fact." [1] Thus the Ascension which occurs in Space and Time has its roots outside Space and Time, and being a process of Life in obedience to the laws of the Universe, it cannot be limited by any *a priori* barriers, but must rather be regarded as a Force which is constantly seeking for self-expression and bursts forth whenever the necessary conditions are present.

If, then, we recur to our previous suggestion that Descent and Ascent are complementary and illustrate one another, we should go a step further and point out that being processes of Life their relation cannot be understood as antecedent and consequent, but rather that of two simultaneous organic movements which go on side by side, or, closer still, like Ezekiel's "fire infolding itself," [2] are involved one in the other, just as in man Thought and Feeling are one act until they are objectified for analysis. So that the Son of Man as a Heavenly Being continually descends and ascends, as is said, "No man has ascended unto the heaven, except He

[1] "What each individual element performs, it performs not as individual, but only so far as being individual it is yet a phase of the universal" (Lotze, *Microcosmus*, i. 385).

[2] Ezekiel i. 4.

that comes down out of heaven, the Son of Man who is in heaven." [1] Man's life then may be said to swing between the two poles of descent and ascent, just as the planets obey the twin laws of centrifugal and centripetal forces. Being, however, in Time the two Forces, which in the aeonian order are timeless and one, are compelled to keep the balance true by alternate action. The soul is plunged into the business of life, the pleasures of life, and into external things in general, because on one side of its being it is descending into Form continually, and all the more surely so, seeing that the motion is as imperceptible as that of the earth round the sun. On the other hand, the soul is as continually ascending, for it cannot but feel and obey the attraction of the invisible world, and respond by Aspiration, Repentance, and Self-sacrifice, by all those acts of Religion which, proceeding as they do from a world above Reason, are so terrible a stumbling-block to those who worship the Goddess of Reason.

The former of these two Forces belongs as we have seen to the jurisdiction of "Satan," the Lord of Form, whose work it is to act as the centrifugal force in the spiritual world, and by Temptation, hardship, and the winds of adversity to see that the individual is built up into a strong, independent, tough, and stubborn Self, able to resist the evil and prepared to choose the good. The latter is the centripetal force which draws back the growing soul to its source, without forcing its will, by the

[1] John iii. 13. The gnomic sense of the aorist is required here, seeing that the "has ascended" does not belong to the temporal order, since Jesus had not at the time of speaking ascended. If "who is in heaven" is a gloss, as is likely, it yet says what is true.

attractive lure of goodness. This is the work which Religion calls *redemption*, and its Head is the Lord Jesus. Obviously no soul is fit for redemption before it has attained some degree of egoistic self-reliance, and hence "Satan" has his necessary negative part to play in the dual soul-process of which the bright and pure side is Redemption.

Now the Bible sets out consistently from its beginning to its end this simple dualistic conception without troubling itself to recommend it by any elaborate intellectual buttressing. It offers us life or death, the life which is God or the death which is Egoism, and bids us choose,[1] and by making the offer it tacitly says that we have already had sufficient experience to enable us, if only we will, to choose rightly. In other words, the Bible asserts dogmatically the supremacy of the world of values, it bids us see the inner meaning in every event, and find the worth of everything by referring it to the Supreme Goodness set before each of us as his final end and sovereign desire. As the soul yields itself to the attraction of this ideal, it ascends to where Christ is, sitting at the right hand of God, and learns to set its mind on things above.

It thus becomes plain that the Ascension, so far from being a superfluous item in the life-story of Jesus Christ, is its necessary consummation, and that not as a singular and disconnected event but as the last member of a long series of spiritual acts which characterised the whole life from the beginning. What the Incarnation effected on the side of humility the Ascension counter-weighted on the side of exaltation. From this there follows the inference to the life of the disciple, that the true

[1] Deut. xxx. 15.

test of his discipleship is to be found, not in the number or the gravity of the sins he commits, but in the general trend of his psychical life. If he sins does he feel indignation, fear, longing, zeal, and avenging ? [1] When courage fails, or his spirits are depressed, or dryness of soul settles down like a blight, or spiritual sloth saps his strength and kills his joy, does he look up and wait for better days in hope ? Does he find that egoistic impulses and delights are losing their hold over him, and love and the joy of service are slowly making their footing good ? Does he delight in prayer in his better moments and fly to it in his worse ? Is he becoming more and more convinced that he had better lose the whole world than his own soul ? Is he rising superior to the attractions of sense, and feeling more at home in the inner world ? Are pride, sloth, envy, jealousy, cynicism, worrying, literalism, and fear, being replaced by humility, joy, sympathy, love, generosity, contentment, humour, and confidence ? If these questions can be answered in the affirmative, even though with some hesitation and many qualifications, then the disciple may be certain that in spite of all appearances to the contrary, and in spite of all his diffidence, he is on the Way, the strait Way, that the Cross is doing its work, and that if he faint not the Ascension of his Lord shall find its counterpart in his own. He whose life is hid with Christ in God shall after (it may be) many lives ascend into the hill of the Lord and sit on his appointed throne and judge the twelve tribes of Israel.

[1] 2 Cor. vii. 11.

CHAPTER XVII

THE SIXTH ARTICLE—PART II

He sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty

Τὸν καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ [Θεοῦ] Πατρός [παντοκράτορος]

THE two O.T. passages which herald the exaltation of the Christ are Ps. ii. and Ps. cx., especially the latter, though their content is different from that of the N.T. article. In the former the Anointed is throned that He may rule with a rod of iron, or wound even kings in the day of His wrath, while in the latter, though authority is emphasised, it is exercised not in a physical but in a spiritual manner.

A. There are two keynotes in this Article, one of which is Authority and the other the Ideal, both being essential to the balanced and four-square character of the Christian.

The authority won at the Ascension is asserted by Jesus Himself in the words, "All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and in earth," [1] where it is necessary to note that the authority referred to is of the spiritual order, for spiritual ends,

[1] Matt. xxviii. 18.

and that " heaven and earth " are not to be understood of localities but of the spiritual order and of the egoistic order respectively. For if the authority were not of a spiritual character the assertion of it would contradict such sayings as John xviii. 36, " My kingdom is not from this world " ; xix. 11, " Thou wouldst have no authority against Me unless it had been given thee from above," which can only mean that had Jesus as a spiritual being not subjected Himself to the " wheel of generation " [1] He would not have been liable to the jurisdiction of Satan and so of Pilate; Luke xii. 14, " Who appointed Me a judge or a divider over you ? " and John viii. 23, " I am not of this world." So, too, if " heaven and earth " is to be taken literally we destroy the fundamental character of the work of Jesus as Redeemer, by transforming it into a creative or preservative activity in the cosmical order, such as that of Vishnu in India.

The authority, then, of Jesus is not cosmical but soteriological. The world has been created, and the human world needs to be re-created. This process of re-creation, or re-generation, by which the soul, as a Prodigal Son, is brought back from its far country and set on the Way that leadeth to eternal life, is that for which Jesus possesses supreme and universal authority. If, however, we allowed ourselves to think of this authority as of the pure transcendent order, and carried into execution apart from His personal intervention by some organ, or some machinery, devised for the purpose, which Jesus once long since established and is now content to watch at a distance, we should fall back into the old, dry deistic belief that there is a Supreme Being

[1] James iii. 6.

but that "He does not at all concern Himself with the government of the world." This belief has long ago been tried in the balances and found wanting. Hence, while reverencing the transcendent authority of Jesus—expressed in the reminder that it is at the right hand of God, the Creator and transcendent Ruler of the Universe, that He as Saviour sits—we shall also insist that His authority is also exercised through living agents in whom He dwells, as is required by the belief that God is immanent as well as transcendent.

In these days when Christianity hardly recognises itself as it is described by its official exponents, and, therefore, has been driven to an apologetic attitude, not wholly unlike that of Uriah Heep, it sounds mere gratuitous audacity to claim Jesus as the Head of all rulers, artists, scientists, and philosophers. Yet this is clearly the claim of the N.T. Not that His function is to rule them as rulers, artists, scientists, or philosophers, but as the giver of the life on which their several capacities depend for their very existence at all. It may be worth while to dwell on this for a moment.

The present age is admitted on all sides to be an age above all things of unrest. The most striking form of this unrest is in the industrial world, where the employed are following an impulse which is driving them with ever-increasing velocity towards the overthrow of the existing economic order. It is easy, of course, to dismiss this movement as at bottom grounded on envy, laziness, and a desire for more animal enjoyment, and to emphasise the virtues of the employers, and the necessary part they play in the production and distribution of wealth. It

is just as easy, on the other side, to point to the unequal distribution of the rewards of labour as between the capitalist and the workman, and to hold up to scorn the luxury in which many of the rich spend their days and lose their souls. Both of these plaintiffs have solid facts at the back of their pleas, but both alike fail to touch the root of the mischief with the tips of their little fingers. For let it be granted fully that the one side is envious and the other self-indulgent, and that they are quarrelling sordidly over the division of the spoils, there still remains the question how force, whether political or revolutionary, is going to do anything but transfer some of the envious to the class of the self-indulgent, and reduce some of those who are now rich to the ranks of the toilers. Will society as a whole be any sweeter because the millionaires have become paupers, and Whitechapel has moved into Belgravia? The point of view is wrong, wrong at both ends, because the eye that takes it squints.

If there were ruling in our Western world a deep-rooted subconscious belief in the soul, and therefore in this world as the soul's testing-place, and in the fitness of the place for it where each soul finds itself; if the rich used their riches as talents committed to their stewardship, as some of them do, and the poor regarded their poverty as the furnace which is to purge out their souls' dross, as some of them also do, then neither would riches be sought nor poverty be refused, but the commands of Jesus sitting at the right hand of the Father would be awaited and obeyed.

> He that appoints the sentinel his room
> Doth license him depart at sound of morning drum.

If Jesus, as God incarnate, be vested with authority, then He chooses the precise place on the social ladder which each of us is to occupy, and He bids us make our footing sure there before He calls us to go up higher—if indeed He does. If we believed in many earthly lives, if we could see that some souls are very young, and some very old, and that it is not necessarily the young soul that is among earth's workers, or the old soul among its great ones, we should be in possession of a canon of judgment which would settle automatically all social or industrial unrest. But it is doubtful whether we have enough religion in our modern Western world to compel us to view life from its inner side, and to consider seriously the possibility that a creed which substitutes many earth-lives for one may be capable of bringing our perplexed world back to God. The Christian anyhow is certain that it is forgetfulness of Jesus on the right hand of God which is the cause of our present troubles. It is not a better political economy we want, but Religion.

At the same time, it would be an improper procedure to dismiss the labour-movement of to-day as iniquitous, irreligious, or iconoclastic. On the contrary, the assertion may be confidently put forward that even though the movement itself be blind, as most great movements are, yet at the back of it is Jesus Himself as the ruler of the souls of men. He is no more a judge and divider over us than He was in the days of His flesh, and, therefore, His care is not primarily whether we are rich or poor, but whether we are loving or selfish. He looks down from His heaven on the children of men who are rich and well-to-do, and He finds them not

redeeming their opportunity of doing good, but using their riches as instruments of pleasure, *i.e.* of selfishness, and hugging their social superiority to their fellows, and accordingly He gives them rulers who plunder them and a social movement from the depths which threatens their sheltered palaces. The rumbling of the storm is already heard on the horizon ; will they have grace to know, as their barbarian forefathers once knew, the thunder for the voice of God, and will they drive in their cattle betimes—that is, their earthly desires and pursuits[1]—when the hail comes down, into the land of Goshen, of God's people, where the hail does not strike ?[2] The storm will probably break, for if men do not submit willingly to the spiritual authority of Jesus they will be broken by it, for His sceptre to those that love Him is as that of Ahasuerus to Esther,[3] but it is as a rod of iron to the heathen to break them in pieces.[4]

Further, if each soul is placed where it is in this world that it may be tested, developed, and advanced, it is also endowed with its peculiar gifts and powers in order that they may be used for the good of others directly, and only indirectly for the fuller life of their possessor. If anybody prefer to regard these gifts and powers as bestowed on the soul at its one and only birth into this world, in preference to their slow growth through many lives under the authority and direction of Jesus,

[1] " God makes use of troubles . . . to free us from whatever impurity there is in the *sensible*, in order to spiritualize it by degrees ; and He does this only by seeming to sully it. The cattle represent our outward nature, which is extremely troublesome when it is in revolt against its Creator, but becomes extremely useful when entirely subjected to Him " (Madame Guyon, on Gen. i. 25).

[2] Ex. ix. 26. [3] Esther v. 2. [4] Ps. ii. 9.

no difference is made in the conditions of trusteeship. For the love of beauty and the craftsmanship of the artist; the sagacity and cool judgment of the statesman; the careful eye and kindled imagination of the scientist; the comprehensive sweep of the philosopher's intellect, are all but God's treasures committed to earthenware vessels. The gulf fixed between their use and abuse is very narrow but very deep; very narrow, for often it is impossible for a man to distinguish between the motive which drives him to use his gifts for his own gratification or his own glory and that which dedicates them to the service of others; very deep because Love and Egoism are mortal enemies.

The first truth then at which the Article of the session of Jesus at the right hand of God aims is that of the establishment of a true Authority over individuals and over society as well. Where the true Authority is forgotten a false authority will usurp the throne. In the case of the individual the one rival to Jesus on His throne is Egoism, for every apparent rival is but one of the hydra-headed forms of this one idol of Egoism. For example, easy good-nature springs from the love of comfort; strife from the desire to snatch life's goods from others; peevishness is discontent with what self has got; sloth is the *vis inertiae* of the material man; pride is his self-assertion; pleasure is the tickling of his nerve-centres; cruelty comes from a self-love which has dulled the sympathetic imagination; and the thirst for moulding others for their good is self-righteousness in disguise. The great lesson we all are set to learn here, each in his way, is the overthrow of the idol of Egoism and the enthroning of God in its place, and the Way to this is the Way of

Crucifixion. None can ascend the hill of the Lord, and sit with Jesus in heavenly places, who has not crucified the Ego and opened his heart to God.

The same truth rules our social structures. Mankind was clearly intended to consist of a number of families or brotherhoods, making in their totality one large Brotherhood ; [1] and wherever the Spirit of love moves and governs, there is the Divine Society. But, as a matter of fact, the Spirit of Jesus gets for the most part lip-homage only, and " Satan " in the form of the modern State rules instead, for what governs nations all over the world is Force as exercised by a small minority, and Force is Satan's instrument, not God's. The amazing thing is that we have been all so completely hypnotised by the existing rule of " Satan " that we are unable to conceive of a Society without laws enforced by sanctions. It is not open to any disciple of Jesus to question the Satanic character of a society which rests on force, for He bade him not to resist evil, that is, the force which makes law-courts necessary and is the instrument they wield.[2] If it be said that the doctrine of Jesus would destroy society by giving the burglar, the bully, the procurer, and the fraudulent company-promoter a loose rein, the answer is that such men are the natural result of our present system, and would die a natural death whenever society worshipped Jesus on His

[1] " The name signifies the recognition of that spiritual organization which is given to all of us alike, and of the worth of that personality which we have to reverence, even in its most insignificant form " (Lotze, *Microcosmus*, ii. 213). It is, however, pernicious to talk, as is commonly done, of all men *as they are* being equal. In Christian language the invisible Christian Church alone is the " Brotherhood " of which local communities are adumbrations. Men taken apart from their spiritual worth are " neighbours," but not " brothers."

[2] Matt. v. 39.

throne. We first manufacture our criminals and then punish them, heedless of the fact that our iniquity is the same in both processes, seeing that we are put here to train ourselves for heaven by love and service, and that we have no authority to " punish " anybody for anything. Nor is it any valid excuse to say that our criminal code is milder than it was once, for where a thing is wrong in principle, degrees of wrongness count for little.

Whether a society which rests on force call itself a despotism, an oligarchy, or a democracy makes no difference, for all are alike instruments of oppression and enemies of true freedom. Indeed, the last of the three in its present imperfect and fraudulent form is the most pernicious because the most hypocritical of all, for in it a minority—a Parliament, a bureaucracy, a Cabinet—oppress the majority after having inoculated them with the foolish belief that they are governing themselves. They are bribed by the gift of votes to surrender themselves as slaves to their political masters, and so the foolish interchange of bribery and slavery is established on which are built most of our modern governments.

There is no cure, says the Christian, for modern ills but the acceptance of the rule of Jesus, as sitting at the right hand of Him Who is eternal justice and infinite love, and the reconstruction of society on the basis of the Love for which He lived and died. If this can only be through a revolution, then welcome the revolution, for " well roars the storm to those that hear a louder voice across the storm." [1]

[1] Récéjac questions this condemnation of a society held together by force in saying that " in order that the Will should detach itself morally from the ego it is necessary that the Good in its active form of Force should be reflected in the world over again," and goes on to say that Society should " see to it that none prevail over others except for the Good

B. Jesus, sitting at the right hand of God, is the fount of authority because He is the Ideal towards which man must strive, or perish. Indeed the Session is but an acute expression of the supremacy of the Ideal to which Jesus dedicated His life. When, for example, He said that man does not live by bread alone but by every word which comes forth through the mouth of God,[1] He was enunciating the great law that man belongs by nature and destiny to the Ideal world, the world of Reality; and that the phenomenal world is but the reflection and instrument of that higher world. No doubt philosophy in the person of Lotze is well advised in confessing its utter inability to bridge the chasm which divides the world of values from this world of forms,[2] but Religion in its turn acknowledging

---

of all." He, however, is forced to admit that on these lines "to the general habit and opinion Goodness is an exotic," and thinks that this does not matter. This conclusion stultifies his whole plea for inner Freedom, and omits to notice that nobody is ever made better by Force (*Bases of the Mystic Knowledge*, p. 261).

There is much more point in Dr. Rashdall's acute remark: "I suspect that when the fear of Hell plays a prominent part in the more ardent and emotional kind of religious conversion, it does so mainly by breaking down the apathy and the slavery to immediate sensation which has hitherto prevented moral reflection. It awakens reflection: after that, it is rather the sense of the justice of the punishment depicted by authority or imagination than the actual fear of it which effects the moral regeneration, though the one idea may often be psychologically inseparable from the other" (*The Theory of Good and Evil*, ii. 263).

[1] Matt. iv. 4.

[2] Lotze, *Microcosmus*, i. 396. In Hegel's philosophy, however, the bridge is builded and crossed. He reduces all consciousness and hence all reality to Thought, not Thought in its abstraction but Thought as the mind's living unity which "naturally protests against any attempt to break it up into different faculties . . . conceived as independent of each other." "We simply cannot escape from thought," he says; "it is present in sensation, in cognition, and knowledge, in the instincts, and in volition, in so far as these are attributes of a human mind." "There is only *one* reason in feeling, volition, and thought." And Hegel regarded Thought as conterminous with experience, the "principle in virtue of which experience is an organic and unitary whole." The difference between Lotze

God's unchangeable laws teaches man to " develop given existence into a knowledge of its value, and the value of his ideals into a series of external forms proceeding from himself." [1] Just as we have seen a moment ago that the Authority which goes forth conquering and to conquer is to be found in the Ideal world with Jesus, so that which attracts and allures man to offer himself a willing and joyful victim shines also from out that same Ideal world.

The world of Understanding, or Cognition, and the world of Values stand over against one another, and though the latter understands the former because it includes it, yet the former is puzzled by the emergence of the latter. All the things indeed which dignify and exalt man belong to the unseen order. Judged by canons of ordinary Understanding, love is the foolishest of all things, for it makes a man surrender what makes life enjoyable for what appears a spectre or a will-o'-the-wisp. Honour, for which men have gladly died, is but the breath of public opinion, except to the man who feels that all visible things without it are contemptible. Purity or Modesty, an object which the libertine regards as to be bought and sold, derives its value to its possessor from another sphere, as both Pagan pro-consul and Christian maiden knew very well, though the latter called it God and the former called it madness. Courage, prudence would say, is a foolish thing unless under the control of a spirit of moderation, but to the mystic it is a virtue without which no other virtue can be at all,

and Hegel here is to be found in the fact that Lotze was passing in thought from the universal in " values " to the particular form, while Hegel reverses the process and insists that the business of philosophy is to discover the logical implications of all sensuous consciousness.

[1] Lotze, *Microcosmus*, i. 401.

and it derives its imperious right to face and submit to all dangers, because the Ideal world from which it springs decides that the self can place no limits to the duty of self-sacrifice for the Good.

But even psychology finds it necessary to allow a place for the Ideal world in its inventory of man's inner goods. The Self we possess is a self-conscious being, and self-consciousness does not mean that the subject which is self-conscious has its own identical self for its object, but rather that one Self is conscious of another self, or, to put it in another way, that the total Self is so split up that "the *I* and the myself are not quite identical." But in either case the language used is not precise, for we do not possess two selves, nor can the one Self be actually divided. Yet the distinction is valid between the *ideal* and the *empirical* Self, the higher and the lower, the potential and the actual.

This distinction is not exhausted by saying that all that the present Self does is to select some given experience, or sets of experiences, of its own which are stored up in its memory, in order that it may posit as the object of its thought its own Self under the point of view of the bearer of those experiences. For this would be to offer to the Self as its object a merely imaginative being who once was, and is now being re-created in thought, whereas the relation between the two carries a greater amount of Reality than imagination can compass. The Self which is engaged in judging has for its object not a self of the past but a self which is still in being.

But again when the Self is oblivious of the element of preteriteness and is merely studying what it calls *itself*, as what it is here and now, the distinction it establishes is real and not apparent.

Unless its eyes are blinded by the dust of some overmastering passion it is conscious that it, as a superior being, is passing judgment on an inferior who yet in some mysterious way is substantially though not formally identical with itself. "The good which I would I do not"; [1] the higher Self sees the good but the lower self refuses to do it. "So it is no more I that do it but sin which dwelleth in me." But sin we have seen is egoism, and egoism is love bound and imprisoned and forced to serve as a blind Samson the Philistines. "There is always an antithesis between ourselves as we are or have been, and ourselves as we wish to be or wish that we had been." [2] But this antithesis is caused by the fact that the Self of man is a denizen of two worlds at the same time, of heaven where he is at home and of earth where he is an exile. It is the heavenly Self which is the ideal Self, which sees the Good and wills it, but finds that on its earthly side it is often powerless to practise and serve and pursue the Good it sees.

The same distinction appears if we enquire what we mean by Self-control. "Self-control is control proceeding from the Self as a whole and determining the Self as a whole. The degree in which it exists depends upon the degree in which this or that special tendency can be brought into relation with the concept of the Self and the system of conative tendencies which it includes." [3] But can Professor Stout tell us how "the special tendency can be brought into relation with the concept of the Self"? or, what is of far more importance, how it can be brought into harmonious relation to the Self itself?

[1] Rom. vii. 19. [2] Stout, *Manual of Psychology*, p. 529.
[3] Stout, *ut supra*, p. 608.

Can any shaking of the kaleidoscope of the "conative tendencies" guarantee that the right pieces shall come to the top? Or again, as our metaphor hints, must there not be some external force to shake the kaleidoscope, and that a purposive force? In this latter case, we are brought back to the Higher Self as that which by right controls the lower self, even though its authority be often defied and generally maintained with difficulty. But this is only to say that self-control is not accurately defined as control of the whole Self by the whole Self, but rather that it is the control which proceeds from the Self as a member of the ideal world, and determines the self as a member of the empirical world.

The Christian statement of this truth is contained in the Article that Jesus Christ, the Word of God become incarnate, the Ideal Man in whose image and likeness we are made,[1] is the ground and origin of our Higher Self which judges our lower, and, therefore, that the maintenance of our spiritual life depends on the communication being kept open between Him and us. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ is, sitting on the right hand of God."[2]

[1] "As the Logos is the basis of all other thoughts and words of God, so It is the archetype of the human Logos, primarily of the thought of Ego, wherein man becomes objective to himself as a person—and of the word for it; then of every thought or inward speech that is effected on this ground of the self-consciousness involved in thought and word" (Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, p. 214).

[2] Col. iii. 1.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE SEVENTH ARTICLE

From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead

Ὅθεν ἔρχεται κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς

Two facts are prominent in this Article, (1) the parousia—the second coming, (2) the judgment; and the second is the purpose of the first.

A. It is customary to explain away the N.T. statements about the second coming in glory as due to the sharing by Jesus of the mistaken apocalyptic views of His time, or to a misinterpretation of what He really said by the N.T. writers who shared those views, but it is not customary for us to lay the blame on our own shoulders by admitting that it is our own materialistic mode of thought which has created the difficulty. The Bible is a book written by men of the Orient, and these men are in the habit of speaking in metaphors, and thinking in analogies, to an extent which is unintelligible to the sober sense of us in the West. And beside this there is the fact that all our thinking and all our talking about super-sensible things can be done only by means of analogies drawn from the world of sense. Thus, if we speak, or the Bible

writers speak, of God being in heaven, of the earth being His footstool, of His repenting, using a stretched-out arm, of looking down from heaven, of ascending into heaven, of sitting between the cherubim, of being in a pillar of cloud, and of acting generally as if He were man, we are not to say off-hand that these expressions are but empty metaphors whose meaning is elsewhere, nor on the other hand are we to say that these expressions stand for closed and exclusive ideas. What they say is true, but it is not the whole truth, for their larger truth can be got only by applying the canon that every event or thing is a symbol of a process which is not exhausted in the production of that event or thing. Heaven is not merely a place above, nor earth merely our globe, nor is God's repentance on all fours with ours, nor does His session between the cherubim exclude Him from the remainder of His world, nor is His stretched-out arm a figurative expression only for some earthly power, such as the Assyrian Empire. All these and similar expressions have a literal meaning, but they have also a symbolic meaning, and in religion it is the symbolic meaning which is at once richer and interpretative of the literal.

We have to apply this truth to the "Second Coming" of Jesus Christ. There is no good reason for denying that He said that the sign of the Son of Man should appear in heaven ; [1] that men should see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of the Power and coming in the clouds of heaven,[2] or with great power and glory.[3] Nor need we hold that the author of the Acts of the Apostles had

[1] Matt. xxiv. 30. [2] Matt. xxvi. 64, Mark xiv. 62.
[3] Mark xiii. 26.

nothing to go upon when he told of two angels affirming that Jesus should return in the same way that He went into heaven.[1] Nor again is the trump of 1 Cor. xv. 52, and 1 Thess. iv. 16, a metaphor only, or literal only. It is rather a metaphor which hints at a great truth. But if we say this of a *trumpet* why may we not also say it of the *clouds*, and proceed to enquire what is the great truth hinted at by the expression " coming in the clouds of heaven ? "

In Biblical symbolism the cloud is the analogical term for the life of faith and trust to which we are called. The cloud is the product of the heat of the sun acting on the waters of the ocean, and counteracted by the coldness of the atmosphere. Similarly, the life of faith is produced by the Love of God acting on the soul, and being counteracted by the coldness of the spirit. While this mortal coldness is ours we are unable to bear the light and fire of the Beatific Vision, and the cloudy life of faith is therefore not only a mark of our imperfection, but also a protection from the heat, just as our physical bodies not only weigh down the soul, but also protect us from the sinister spiritual powers[2] around us, to whom we should fall a readier prey but for the " coats of skins " with which the Lord God has clothed us.[3] To carry the metaphor one step further, we may add that as clouds are driven by the winds (or follow the winds), and as they present the most gorgeous colours ever seen by the eye of man, so the life of faith follows the impulse of the spirits of God, and is the formal cause of all the moral beauties seen in the life of man. God's bow in the cloud is His

[1] Acts i. 11. [2] Eph. ii. 2. [3] Gen. iii. 21.

fixed emerald glory,[1] steadying and engoldening our souls; His enveloping cloud is a light to His saints, a darkness to His enemies;[2] in the cloud on the mercy-seat of our spirit He dwells;[3] in the daytime of our pilgrimage He leads us by the cloud of faith;[4] it was to the ear of faith that the voice from out the cloud came on the Mount;[5] and similarly Jesus in His glory is at once hidden and seen by means of the cloud which is faith.[6]

If Jesus then is to come in the clouds of heaven it will be a real coming, and not only a phenomenal coming; that is to say, a coming in material form, like a resurrection in material form, is the least part of the tremendous event, for such a coming, if that were all of it, would be subject to the law of change and decay which rules over the world of Becoming. But if it be urged that the coming is with glory we reply that this is true, and, therefore, it is not only material, for the two terms "glory" and "material" are antithetical. The "glory" may use the "material" for its organ, but the two belong to different worlds and appear to different faculties. The appearing, when it does take place, will be a real appearing and not only a phenomenal. It will be in the clouds of heaven, not in the heaven

[1] Rev. iv. 3. [2] Exod. xiv. 20. [3] Lev. xvi. 2.
[4] Ps. lxxviii. 14. [5] Matt. xvii. 5.

[6] Acts i. 9. Of course the word faith is used here in its Biblical meaning of that spiritual energy which takes God as the rock of the heart and its portion for ever (Ps. lxxiii. 25), or in Eucken's of the recognition of the inner presence of an infinite energy, being the divine spirit in man reaching out after, grasping, and absorbing the Divine Spirit, the *actio directa* of the soul, the *supplex fiducia* by which it confidently claims its own from God its Father. Belief, or "the assent to that which is credible as credible" of Bishop Pearson, is far removed from the "knowing of God by the heart" which the Bible calls faith. Faith is the "life of God in the soul," and is therefore compared to the grain of mustard-seed, not because it is small, but because it is *alive*.

of pure spirit, nor on the earth of matter, but in the middle world of "faith," where God is apprehended but not yet comprehended.[1]

But we should be leaving half-told the story of the Parousia if we placed it in the future in such a sense as to overlook its happening in the present, and moreover, we should be thereby showing ourselves heedless of a hint contained in the Article itself we are considering. Whatever the reason may be, it does not say that Jesus shall come but that Jesus is coming.[2] It is for those, therefore,

[1] "It is to be remarked that God said 'He would appear in the cloud upon the oracle.' This is an admirable figure. For it is certain that it is only through the nakedest faith that the soul truly has a perpetual access into its centre where God dwells. God covers and envelops, so to speak, His majesty with a cloud; everything is done and accomplished in this divine obscurity in which the soul neither sees, feels, knows, nor discerns anything but a profound silence" (Madame Guyon on Lev. xvi. 2).

"God covereth with clouds of figures the heaven of the Scriptures" (St. Aug. *En. in Pss.*, Ps. cxlvii. 8).

"Not prophets only, but all who with the word of God water souls, may be called clouds" (*ibid.* in Ps. xi. 6).

"What are the clouds? The preachers of the word of God" (*ibid.* in Ps. xxxvi. 5). Cf. in Ps. civ. 3: "The authority of the Scriptures is spread out over the world, clouds are not wanting, the word of truth is preached, all things that are obscure are expounded, that your hearts may ascend by the clouds."

Mediaeval writers carried on the tradition which identified the clouds with the Apostles as men who had been drawn up out of ignorance and worldliness into the heavenly wisdom of contemplation by the Sun of Righteousness in order that their doctrine might drop as the rain to fertilise the earth. This is referred to in the *Paris Breviary, Common of Apostles*:

"Totum per orbem nuntii,
Nubes velut, citi volant:
Verbo graves, Verbo Deo
Tonant, coruscant, perpluunt."

And Hugh of St. Cher sums up the likeness of Apostles and clouds in two pithy hexameters:

"Pulsa notis: procul a terris: mare linguit: in imbres
Solvitur, et tonitrus: volat: et tenuata dat Irim."

[2] Cf. p. 269 above. It is no valid objection to this pressing of the full force of the present tense to say that the Greek of the N.T. period had lost its classical distinctness and sharp edge, and that this use of the present

who interpret the future tense of the N.T. of a single, isolated event happening on a given date (as the Creation was once thought to have taken place) to show cause why this future should not be rendered as describing a continuous process beginning immediately after the prophecy of it. Is there any reason in grammar, or logic, or in canons of exegesis why Acts i. 11, "This same Jesus shall so come," should not be understood to mean, "This same Jesus shall begin at once to come in like manner, and shall continue His visitation until the time of restitution of all things?" This interpretation has the advantage of combining the two points of view which are represented respectively by the use of the present tense and of the future.[1]

---

for the future is but an example of this decadence, for the N.T. itself uses the future tense of the Second Coming. Cf. Matt. xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64, Acts i. 11, xvii. 31. The present is used in 1 Thess. v. 2, Eph. v. 6, and generally in the Fourth Gospel. Both tenses are combined in Rev. i. 7. The truth really seems to be that both types of mind are represented in the N.T., viz. that which fastens on the *event* which is yet future, and the mystic which sees the *process* as ever-present. Our Article follows this latter. In the main Blass supports this conclusion from the philological view-point. "Classical Greek," he says, "was acquainted with a (lively and imaginative) present for future, and this present—a sort of counterpart to the historic present—is very frequent in the predictions of the N.T. It is not attached to any definite verbs, and it is purely by accident that ἔρχομαι appears with special frequency in this sense. . . . But verbs of going and coming when used in the present also have the meaning of being in course of going (or coming), in which case the arrival at the goal still lies in the future." The present tense denotes an action as (1) in duration (its progress) or (2) in present time. But in the latter case the present may embrace the time immediately preceding or succeeding the time of speech, and this may be more and more lengthened so as to embrace all time. It is then, we may conclude from the remarks of Blass, a question of interpretation in each case, whether the present is used in this extended sense, and this the context and agreed-on postulates must determine (Blass, *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, London, 1905, pp. 187, 189). See p. 271 above.

[1] "The belief in the *duplex adventus Christi* formed one of the most important articles of Church belief in contradistinction to Judaism and

But in what sense then are we to understand the assertion that Jesus is ever coming since His Ascension? It is here that the Fourth Gospel comes to our aid with its significant doctrine of the coming of the Paraclete. In it Jesus implies that He Himself is the first Paraclete, that is, a heavenly Being become Man in order to stand by the side of His brethren to inspire, comfort, and strengthen them; in it He says expressly that He will send, or the Father will send (the two are not distinguished, except formally), a second Paraclete to guide Christians into the whole truth,[1] to unveil the future,[2] to recall the past,[3] to dwell in them,[4] and to confute the world,[5] and He adds that the second Paraclete is but the first in another form.[6]

The "second coming," therefore, of Jesus is the practical and active outcome of the truth of the authority which is His at the right hand of the Father. Were this first truth not supplemented by the second the authority would remain glorious but ineffective, a joy possibly to the inhabitants of heaven, but of little use to those fast bound in misery and iron on earth. But the Article affirms that He is ever coming to us—we shall see in a moment what the object of the coming is—and this fact is the ground of our hope of salvation. For it requires very little knowledge of our inner life to know that, left to our own devices, we can but

---

Gnosticism. . . . But the belief in the return of Christ to this world necessarily involved the hope of a kingdom of glory under Christ upon earth, and without this hope is merely a rhetorical flourish" (Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, Eng. trans. ii. 295). Mysticism adds that hope in its own form.

[1] John xvi. 13. [2] *Ibid.* [3] xiv. 26. [4] xiv. 17. [5] xvi. 8.
[6] xiv. 18. The same identification is made in 2 Cor. iii. 17.

tread a weary round of sin and remorse, like a donkey at a mill. We are what we are by nature, and we become different by nurture only; hence if the forces which go to nurture us belong to the world of Nature only there is no hope of our transcending Nature and finding the inner world of Freedom which is the Kingdom of Heaven. It is not enough to point us to the uplifting powers issuing from the Bible or from the Church, for though in both we are brought into contact with saints in the past (in the Bible) or in the present (in the Church), yet both are but living forces on the side of Goodness which in themselves are external to us and become effective only when the Divine Life which lies at the ground of our being awakens from its grave-clothes and seizes on the truth offered from without. But this Spirit that slumbers within is the hidden man of the heart,[1] or the Christ that liveth in us,[2] and whenever there comes to our conscious, or even half-conscious, life in the outer court a still, small voice from His Holy of Holies within, to call us to repentance, to fill us with shame and confusion of face, to make us lift up our eyes to the eternal hills, and to inspire faith, hope and charity, then literally and actually we see fulfilled the prophecy that He should so come as He went away. He went from the sight of the soul into the cloudland of faith; He comes again in the light of Love.

Perhaps there should be added to what has just been said a reference to the work of angels in our salvation, both because on the one hand that work is depreciated or set aside, and also because on the other it is raised to an eminence to which it is

[1] 1 Peter iii. 4. [2] Gal. ii. 20.

not entitled. Where Reason[1] is supreme arbiter the doctrine of angels is banished to the limbo of ancient superstition with the mythology of primitive peoples, on the ground that the times in which we live offer no adequate evidence of the working of angels, and none, therefore, of their existence. Hence it says that whatever the Bible or the Church may say on the subject must be explained as the idle imaginings of a more poetic age. On the other hand, where Truth is not worshipped as a chaste and exacting deity, minds which easily accept as fact what their inclinations announce to be desirable run naturally into the lowest depths of superstition in "a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels."[2] The truth as taught in the Bible, and verifiable, we make bold to say, by any religious soul which pays sufficient attention to the course of its inner experience, is that invisible beings do step into our lives as shapers of their growth, but that they never penetrate into the adytum of the spirit where God directly dwells and at times reveals Himself. God uses the course of this world, He uses men, whether good or bad, He uses also invisible beings who being His messengers are well called *angels*, that they may all bring to us from without some stimulus He sees us to need at the moment; but His own work within remains His own, and is delegated to none. The help that is done upon earth He doeth it Himself. His "second coming," therefore, to the soul is not the coming of a delegate, however august, but the approach to the soul in love of One who is closer to us than breathing, nearer than hands or feet, the Dweller in the Innermost, the Hidden Ground of the Soul,

[1] "Des Teufels Braut, *Ratio*," as Luther called it. [2] Col. ii. 18.

the Light which shines through the "apex" or Fünklein of the soul.

B. The "Second Coming" of Jesus is defined as having for its object Judgment, and the object of the Judgment is the quick and dead. It is, to say the least, unfortunate that attention should have been fixed exclusively on the final act of this judgment, and that in consequence the process which results in that climax should have been lost sight of. For the object of our concern for all practical purposes is not so much the closing event as the continuous process which is going on in our midst here and now, and, moreover, the only effective preparation for the crisis consists in present obedience to the law which the process reveals to us day by day. "Every morning the Lord bringeth judgment to light," [1] and not only at the end of all things. "*Now* is the judging of this world." [2]

The verb *judge* is a comprehensive term and signifies the weighing of the evidence, the decision of the appointed authority, the expressed sentence, and the execution of the sentence. The first and last of these are the salient moments, and the two intermediary terms are but bridges between the facts brought forward and the fruit they bear in the consequences which follow. But inasmuch as the popular mind is more adapted to deal with the final result than to understand the process by which definite acts have issued necessarily in that result, it has come to pass that to judge means ordinarily the act by which the person concerned is formally handed over to the consequences of the sentence, whether this be favourable or unfavourable. But

[1] Zeph. iii. 5. [2] John xii. 31.

where the springs of action count for more than the actions themselves it is the weighing of the evidence which is the all-important factor, for in a world governed according to unalterable law the other three factors follow necessarily the direction assigned them by the facts disclosed.

Hence the Divine Judgment is concerned as a process in the work of weighing the evidence, that is, of testing the individual before it. The κρίσις which in full measure the Father has given to the Son,[1] the κρίσις which is even now going on,[2] which the Paraclete makes clear,[3] the κρῖμα, or definite act for which the Christ is come, all centre round the crucial act of testing. This may lead to acquittal or condemnation, to happiness or to misery, but the pivot of the complex action is in the testing which forms the tongue of the balance, and leans to the one side or the other as determined by what the act of testing discloses.

Now this testing is a process which knows no cessation, but only moments of greater or less intensity. It is unbroken, as creation and redemption are unbroken. It is commonly said that we shall be judged not so much by what we have done as by what we are, and it is added that what we are is the result of what we have done. Both of these statements are true, but neither refers to a third truth of even greater importance, viz. that everything we do is our own response at the moment to a voice of God, and that therefore it is an automatic register of the measure of our worth. The presence of God with us, therefore, and the appeal which that presence inevitably makes to our Will (for God is not an inert Object but an active Power),

[1] John v. 22. [2] John xii. 31. [3] John xvi. 11.

constitute the testing for which He comes to us. "This is the testing," He says, "that the Light has come into the world," and that some set themselves against it and some come to it.[1] For it is the Light which puts all things to the test, and shows what is their worth; it is the Light which manifests everything.[2]

An easy test of our religious worth is offered by this Scriptural view of the meaning of the common events and doings of daily life, and indeed it is hardly too much to say that the difference between religion and irreligion consists in just this, viz. that Religion sees God's purpose in everything, while irreligion takes things as they come, and welcomes them or curses them as they are agreeable or disagreeable to the self. The irreligious man does not see that while he is passing judgment on hedonistic lines he is himself being weighed in the balances and found wanting. The religious man may but dimly see what the Divine meaning of daily things and happenings may be, but he sees anyhow that some purpose there is, of no small importance,[3] and he sets himself to find it out, and when found to conform himself to it. Both are put to the test, and both co-operate with God in bringing on themselves the next appropriate test, the one in his darkness, the other in the Light, for according to a Rabbinical saying, "the reward of a commandment is a commandment," and

[1] John iii. 19-21. [2] Eph. v. 13.

[3] Cf. for the importance of a lofty value of Christian verities 2 Clem. i. 1: "Brethren, we ought so to think of Jesus Christ as of God, as of the judge of quick and dead; and we ought not to think meanly of our salvation." On the other hand, "we learn that the regula of Apelles closed with the words, "ἀνέστη εἰς οὐρανὸν ὅθεν καὶ ἦκε instead of ὅθεν ἔρχεται κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς" (Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, i. 261).

similarly we may say that the penalty of a prohibition is a prohibition.

C. The objects of testing, or judgment, are defined as the "living and dead." The habit of interpreting this phrase automatically of those who are still enjoying life in this upper air, and of those who have joined the "great majority" in the world of shades is so firmly established that it is seldom questioned. Yet a little consideration should show that the distinction between those physically alive and those physically dead is not a distinction on which the Gospel lays any stress. For what the Gospel is concerned with is the spiritual condition of man, not his physical life, or the negation of it. The life it emphasises is the life of the spirit, and the death it delivers from is the death which sin inflicts on the soul. If it be said, for example, that Jesus by rising again overcame death, the plain facts of everyday forbid us to refer this victory to physical death, for men and women are struck by it now as before. And if this difficulty is met by saying that it is not death but the terrors of Death which Jesus ended, then we rejoin that this conquest was won then in the spiritual order, by conferring on man a spiritual exaltation which should enable him to face Death unconcernedly. But this is to admit practically that the purpose of the work of Jesus had nothing directly to do with physical life and death, but with spiritual life and death only. Forgetfulness of the distinction between the two is forgetfulness of the fixed opposition set by the nature of things between the world of Freedom and the world of Necessity, and forgetfulness of this involves shipwreck of the Christian Faith. No doubt the Christian, like everybody else, is subject

to the mechanism of the universe, of which decay, change, and physical death are expressions, but he is subject not as a Christian, but as a member of the phenomenal order. As a Christian his life is hid with Christ in God, and no power of any death can penetrate to that hidden tabernacle.

It would be impossible to refer even to all the N.T. passages where the living or the dead are mentioned—the phrase alone occurs some six hundred times. But one or two passages may suffice. In Matt. xxiii. 27 dead men's bones are used to illustrate profaneness and lawlessness. In Rom. x. 7 the raising of Christ from the dead is expressly interpreted as the bringing up of religion out of the depth of the heart. In Matt. xxii. 32 Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are declared to be alive with a life above this present life of Becoming—of marrying and being married—that is, with a spiritual life, and therefore the dead are not those in the non-physical state of being, but those devoid of spiritual life. In Matt. viii. 22 the unspiritual are the dead. In 1 Peter iv. 6 it is to men dead in trespasses and sins to whom the Gospel was preached, in order that they might be put to the test (κριθῶσι) while in the flesh, and so live to God in their spirit. In Col. i. 18 the "first-begotten from the dead," who is also "the first-begotten of every creature," is so as being One who had stooped to the realm of souls in spiritual death, and had overcome in His own Person that spiritual death which held them fast. In John v. 25 it is the spiritually dead who there and then were to hear the voice of the Son of Man, and so gain spiritual life. In the same chapter it is said plainly that there are two modes of Being, one which is that of "aeonian life," the

way into which is through effective hearing of the Word of God joined to self-committal to that Word, and the other which is called Death, the characteristic of which is subjection to a testing or judging process (*v.* 24). The " hearing " which the disciple performs is of the same nature as that which the Word of God also performs for His Father; and what the One or the other hears forms the ground of the testing to which everything else is subjected (*v.* 30; cf. 1 Cor. ii. 15). The process is a present process, and is, moreover, automatic, so that it can be said that when the resurrection from listening to one's Ego takes place, and instead of it there is instituted a listening to the Word of God, not only is the resurrection past, but so is the judgment, for the man *has* passed from death into life.

It is true that the testimony of the Fourth Gospel to the antithesis of spiritual life and spiritual death in place of physical life and physical death is more explicit than that of the other N.T. books, but it would be an unjustifiable inference from the explicitness to say that the other books have the second antithesis in view. They have not, but they express the same antithesis in a different way, and even when they express an opinion on physical death they subsume that death under the more comprehensive category of a prior spiritual death.[1]

[1] In the parable of the Prodigal Son it was said that he was dead because He had left his Father (Luke xv. 24, 32); in 2 Tim. iv. 1 it is the spiritually living and the spiritually dead who are to be the objects of judgment at the epiphany of Jesus, where the placing the event in the future does not negate its process in the present, or justify us in thinking of the people referred to as physically alive or dead; in Luke xxiv. 5 it is said of Jesus that it was useless to seek Him as the living one among those who were dead, that is, the sphere of life into which He had risen was so immeasurably higher than that of the dead of this world that He must be sought elsewhere.

On the whole, then, we must conclude that the true sense of this important Article is to be arrived at only by regarding it as the statement of a spiritual truth before it can affirm what may become an empirical event. And in assuming this higher character it only does what every one of the previous Articles has done. The Creed opens with an affirmation that Reality is of the spiritual order, and is identical with One who is the Father of Jesus Christ and in Him of all things; it regards this empirical world, therefore, as not itself the Reality, though it may express Reality. It proceeds to posit the Force which lies behind this phenomenal order as the Divinity which as *Christ* is the hidden root of all Truth, Beauty, and Goodness, and as *Jesus* is the redeeming (or uplifting, attracting, quickening) Power in the world. It declares next that through a New Birth alone of Water and Spirit is entrance afforded to the children of men into this higher world of which Jesus Christ is Lord and King; that this New Birth is completed through Crucifixion, *i.e.* through the substitution of Love for Egoism; that citizenship in the Heavenly country is then attained permanently, to which act of naturalisation is given the name of Resurrection; that on Resurrection follows Ascension, or the resumption of the celestial *form* which was laid aside in order that through the lessons learned in the laboratory of this world the potential might become an actual glory. Next Ascension involves the right to rule all lower spheres by virtue of the lofty position given at the right hand of God; and the actual exercise of that authority out of the heavenly world and in the earthly world by the constant proffer to every soul in the body moment

by moment of the Divine Idea of Goodness, Truth, and Beauty, which constitutes a perpetual testing, and so a discrimination between living souls and dead souls,[1] between the sheep placed on the right hand, and the goats placed on the left, the chosen types of Love and Egoism respectively.[2]

[1] Cf. Augustine, *Enchiridion*, Bened. ed. vi. 217: "The coming to judge the quick and the dead may be understood in two ways: the quick may be those whom He will find still in the flesh when He comes and the dead those who have left the body; or the quick are the righteous and the dead the unrighteous, for the righteous also shall be judged."

[2] The fact that the judging or testing is attributed to Christ as well as to Satan is no contradiction, but only the setting out the fact from another point of view. Satan tempts (or tests) in his own limited and subordinate capacity, and so carries out the tempting or testing which God by His own inherent right carries out, as *e.g.* in the case of Abraham. But Satan's function ends when the test has been applied; the result of the testing falls outside his jurisdiction. On the other hand, when Jesus Christ judges or tests, He does so educationally as part of the discriminative process which must precede the final judgment. Whatever this final judgment may mean it must in any case be understood by what experience teaches us about the nature of the judgment which is already in process.

CHAPTER XIX

THE EIGHTH ARTICLE

I believe in the Holy Ghost

Καὶ εἰς πνεῦμα ἅγιον

THE first noticeable point in this Article is its non-theological character, which the absence in the Greek of the definite article denotes. Whether this indeterminateness points to the formula of Father, Son, and Spirit, or to that of God, Jesus Christ, and Spirit, concerns us here very little.[1] What concerns us more is the fact that it points to a comparatively pre-theological period, when no serious disputes had as yet arisen about the formulation of belief in the Spirit as the third Person of the Blessed Trinity. It was enough in the early baptismal formula which succeeded that of baptism in the Name of Jesus to express belief in a Divine Spirit with whose workings every Christian was personally familiar.[2] This fluid state of the term,

[1] See p. 66, note.

[2] *Holy Spirit* with the definite article occurs forty times in the N.T. and forty-nine without. When the article is used it points for the most part to a person who puts forth personal acts of revelation (Luke ii. 26), prohibition (Acts xvi. 6), witnessing (Heb. x. 15); where the article is wanting the reference is always to a spirit of holiness of which the believer is made a partaker (1 Thess. iv. 8 is the only exception). But even where the personality of the Spirit is emphasised no indication is given that any Divine relationship of Persons is contemplated—except in Matt. xxviii. 19—not even in 2 Cor. xiii. 13.

so far as it goes, favours the hypothesis of the mystic character of the religion of Jesus Christ in its essence and first manifestation, and of the consequently later appearance of its doctrinal or dogmatic expression. This distinction is unfortunately neglected by Dr. Swete,[1] who frequently inserts the definite article in his translation of passages from the Isapostolic writers. Instances of this are: 1 Clem. ii. 2, p. 12; 1 Clem. xlii. 3, p. 13; Ignatius, *Ad Ephes.* xviii. 2, p. 16; *ad Mag.* xiii. 1, *ibid.*; *Marty. Polyc.* xiv. 2, 3, p. 17; *Barn.* x. 2, xiii. 5, p. 18; *Didache*, xi. 7, p. 20, xi. 12, p. 21; Hermas, *Mand.* xi. 2, p. 23. On page 33 Dr. Swete wrongly takes ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ with καταβάς; it belongs to ὁμολογεῖται and has no definite article. Similarly Dr. Swete inserts the article in Justin, *Trypho*, iv. 7, p. 34; *Apol.* i. 6, p. 36. This procedure, as Dr. Swete would be the first to admit, antedates illegitimately the theological doctrine of the Trinity, and is responsible for Dr. Swete's wonder that Justin should have equated "a prophetic spirit" with the angels. Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, ii. 209, to whom Dr. Swete refers, admits in a sentence the justice of this criticism when he says that "we cannot at bottom say that the Apologists possessed a doctrine of the Trinity." Still less the Prophets.

The first meaning of the Article then—as it is the last, the theological being the middle term—is that the believer knows, and in his capacity grasps, a Spirit which reveals Itself to him as different from the spirit which governs the ordinary world of humanity.[2] In that world are to be found exempli-

[1] *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, 1912.

[2] Messrs. Oelsner and Wicksteed in their note on Dante's *Paradiso*, xiv. 67-78 (Temple Classics) say of the poet's description of the appearance of the third circle of the Holy Spirit that "in its dimness at first and

fied in the life of every day some one or other of the sad catalogue of social vices and personal defilement. Hatred and anger, envy and jealousy, fear and despair, lust and gluttony, cruelty and oppression, pride and vanity, sloth and idleness prevent the building of Jerusalem in our green and pleasant land, and rob the life of those under the sway of any of them of all its peace and joy. These vices which occupy so prominent a place in every life which has not given itself to God were only too familiar to the world out of which were drawn the early Christians, and they form the ground of invective of all the Christian Apologists which was directed against the hostility of that world to their faith.

But to suppose that the antithesis of pagan viciousness and Christian virtue is the key to Christianity would be the worst of historical or of religious blunders. For there came a day when the Church lost her freshness and purity, and when Jerome and Salvianus took up the pen of a Juvenal to lash the vices of Christian men and Christian women, and when for all that a fundamental difference yet divided the Christian from the Pagan world. For all vice rests at bottom on Egoism, and the Spirit of Egoism is never wholly extirpated before "the mystic marriage" takes place, and yet is being as surely supplanted, if slowly, by the

---

brightness afterwards, there may be a reference to the difficulty that has always been experienced in finding an adequate *philosophical* basis for the doctrine of the Third Person of the Trinity corresponding to the clearness of the distinction between the conceptions of God in his essence (Father) and God as manifested (Son); whereas to the non-strictly *theological* speculation, or rather to the religious experience, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit (regarded not as the Creator or the Redeemer, but as the Inspirer) has always had a special vividness."

Spirit of Love which is the peculiar spirit of Christianity.

Thus a convert in Apostolic times, or indeed of the first three centuries, would be fully aware of the new force brought to bear upon him in his baptism into the name of Jesus. Even if his newly-found joy and exhilaration in his freedom drove him to exaggerate somewhat the moral evil he had formally set himself against in leaving the worship of Isis or Dionysus for the worship of the Father of Jesus Christ, yet in broad outlines he knew that the statement that he had passed from darkness to light was unutterably true. It was not so much that he was no longer liable to fall into his old vices —the N.T. negatives this—but that something had happened to him which put him in a new relation to them of hostility and condemnation. His better and higher self had been roused from its slumber; a definite principle of life had been put before him; the nearness, as well as the holiness of God had been demonstrated in bodily form, and the result was that there fell from his spiritual eyes, as it had been, scales, and he saw with his immortal eye the King in His beauty, and surrendering to Him vowed to devote the rest of his life to His service.

When we think of the enthusiasm which inspired those early days, and of the joy even with which poor men and feeble women went to torture and death for Christ's sake, the emphasis placed by Gibbon on the five secondary causes of the triumph of Christianity is seen to be superficial.[1] For zeal

[1] The rapid growth of the Christian Church "was most effectually favoured and assisted by the five following causes: (i.) The inflexible, and if we may use the expression, the intolerant zeal of the Christians, derived, it is true, from the Jewish religion, but purified from the narrow and unsocial spirit which instead of inviting had deterred the Gentiles from

is not evoked unless by a principle of life; nor is the doctrine of a future life efficacious unless its first beginnings are already a matter of experience here; nor were the so-called miraculous powers mere hallucinations; nor did the austerity of Christian morals spring from nowhere; nor was the Christian Church ever guilty in its purer days of setting up so chaotic a thing as a republic; it was a kingdom with Christ as its invisible King, and His Spirit as His Vicar on earth; hence the secret of its strength when assailed by all the forces, moral or physical, of the older pagan world. In other words, no account of the triumph of Christianity which omits the one *vera causa*, the activity of the Spirit of God in the hearts and lives of Christians, can be satisfactory or coherent or even intelligible.

This truth, however, is not a truth which concerns only or chiefly the Church of the first centuries of our era, for there has never ceased to be a time in which it was the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*. Even though the rulers of the Church may have been caught in their own trap when they set out to spoil the Egyptians by taking over their feast-days, items of their cult, or dogmas of their philosophy, and when they became as bishops civil judges, even though in the persons of their great Schoolmen they lost their Christian way in the by-paths of Rationalism, and since the Refor-

---

embracing the law of Moses. (ii.) The doctrine of a future life, improved by every additional circumstance which could give weight and efficacy to that important truth. (iii.) The miraculous powers ascribed to the primitive Church. (iv.) The pure and austere morals of the Christians. (v.) The union and discipline of the Christian republic, which gradually formed an independent and increasing state in the heart of the Roman empire" (*Decline and Fall*, ch. xv., 1901, ed. J. B. Bury, vol. ii. p. 2).

mation have forgotten the art of the categorical imperative in matters of faith and morals,[1] yet the torch of Divine truth has been always kept alight in the darkest days by the Spirit of truth Himself.

If individual names are cited in support of this proposition it is not that they are more holy than thousands of their contemporaries, but only that they happen to be better known. St. Ignatius of Antioch is not remembered because of his theories of ecclesiastical government, but because he died for his faith. St. Jerome is great, not so much as a scholar, but as one who sought to take the kingdom of heaven by violence. St. Augustine was a suggestive and subtle thinker, but it was not his reasoning powers but his life-long passion for truth which distinguished him; for one who knows his *De Civitate Dei* or his *De Trinitate*, hundreds know his Sermons and thousands his Confessions. Gregory the Great was great as a doctor of the Church, but greater as a saint. St. Bernard swayed Popes and Kings, but it is more that he ruled himself. The Abbot Joachim fascinates us still, not for his historical schematism, but because he was an apostle of the Spirit. St. Francis and the Peerless Maid had the orthodoxy of the heart. An Eckhart, a Tauler, a Suso, a Thomas More, a Lancelot Andrews, the two Catherines of Siena

[1] To do it justice the Roman Church alone has retained this primitive audacity; witness the "Constitutio dogmatica prima de ecclesia Christi" of the Vatican Council, cap. iv.: "Docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus: Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit ea infallibilitate pollere qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; . . . ideoque ejusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae irreformabiles esse."

and Genoa, Madame Guyon, Fénelon, Ignatius Loyola, George Fox, John Wesley, William Law, St. Francis de Sales, and an immense cloud of other witnesses — who cares how such men expressed their vision of the Great Secret when the fact is once established that they had their vision through the Spirit which was given to them? The important thing to bear in mind is, that it is individuals as such who are the subjects of the working of the Spirit, and not communities or voluntary societies or churches taken in the gross. The Spirit can and does work on many individuals at the same time, and where His work is effective a Church is formed *ipso facto*, even though it never attain to form or organisation. And it is the startling as well as the joyful paradox of the spiritual life that it wins freedom by self-surrender only, and that man becomes more of an individual by submitting to God, the one and only Individual in the fullest sense that there is. Christ's service is perfect freedom—*cui servire regnare est.*

This, then, is the first affirmation that is made when the Christian says, "I believe in (the) Holy Ghost." He makes the most daring venture of faith that human life affords, for he throws down his glove in defiance of the whole apparent forces of the world as it is, and challenges them to move him if they can from his allegiance to Him who is his invisible King. And the courage required for this encounter lies precisely in the fact that from it there is no discharge. In spite of a low moral standard on all sides of triumphant wickedness, or at best of successful pushfulness, and in spite of what is still harder to recover from, viz. his own lapses from his ideal, the Christian engages himself

to speak true, right wrong, and follow this King in all circumstances. He deliberately defies the "world," and takes his stand under the banner of the Christ, and offers himself as an agent of the Spirit of holiness for the ends of righteousness. No greater act of faith than this can be made, and none that calls for loftier courage or greater fortitude for perseverance in well-doing. Let those who have made the venture of faith bring forward their testimony.

But not only as the Spirit of holiness is the Spirit of God (or of the Father, or of Jesus, as He is variously called) represented in the N.T. He fills the whole field of religion. He illuminates the intellect because He is the Spirit of the truth.[1] The truth which the Spirit leads the spirit of man into is the truth about God, about man and the relation of the two, and His help as guide is needed because on the one side God is a God who hides Himself for very greatness, and man is a being whose true nobility is hidden by sin out of sight.

The method by which the Spirit leads us into the truth is by inspiration from within, when He tells us what to say in critical moments without drawing by premeditation on our own intellectual stores,[2] by opening up to intuition the hidden treasures of our sub-conscious or super-conscious minds. This is a phenomenon which is familiar to many, ignored by most, ordinarily despised and

[1] John xiv. 17, xv. 26, xvi. 13; neither B. Weiss nor Westcott brings out the force of the definite article before *truth* in these three passages as Holtzmann in the *Hand-Kommentar* does when he says on the last that the Spirit "wird in den ganzen Zusammenhang der in Christus gegebenen Wahrheit einführen." Kreyenbühl emphasises it also in the title of his suggestive work *Das Evangelium der Wahrheit.*

[2] Matt. x. 20, Luke xii. 12.

dismissed as a depreciation of Reason. Yet in the early Church prophets with apostles and teachers occupy an earlier and a more honourable place than presbyters or "bishops." They are officers of the whole Church and not of special communities; they are not elected, but are the direct agents of the Spirit Himself. To them belonged outside the N.T. Ignatius of Antioch and Hermas.[1]

[1] In the famous passage of the letter of the former to the Philadelphians the writer expressly says that when he shouted aloud in the assembly, "Pay heed to the bishop and the presbytery and the deacons," he said this through the spirit, that is, he spoke as a prophet inspired at the moment (ch. vii.). For Hermas as a prophet see Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung*, p. 247. Hermas himself gives a vivid picture of the prophetic method, "When there comes a man who has the divine spirit into an assembly of righteous men who have faith in the divine spirit, and prayer is entered upon to the God of the assembly of those men, then the angel of the prophetic spirit that reposes with him fills the man, and the man being filled with the holy spirit speaks to the assembly as the Lord wills" (*Mand.* xi. 9). The statement of Gregory of Nyssa that the Creed of Gregory Thaumaturgus was revealed to this latter by the Virgin Mary and John the Apostle is a later example of theological truths being brooded over until they are ripe for prophetic utterance. The Creed is given in Harnack, *History of Dogma*, iii. 115. Harnack contrasts the "enthusiastic" triad of Apostles, Prophets, Teachers with that of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and laments that the origin of both triads as well as of the lesser Orders remains obscure (p. 253). Cf. also his *History of Dogma* (Eng. trans.) i. 213: "The Apostolic age transmitted a twofold organisation to the communities. The one was based on the 'service of the word,' and was regarded as established directly by God; the other stood in the closest connection with the economy of the Church, above all with the offering of gifts, and so with the sacrificial service. In the first were men speaking the word of God, commissioned and endowed by God, and bestowed on Christendom, not on a particular community, who as 'apostles, prophets, and teachers' had to spread the Gospel, that is, to edify the Church of Christ. They were regarded as the real 'leaders' in the communities, whose words given them by the Spirit all were to accept in faith. In the second were 'bishops' and 'deacons' appointed by the individual congregation and endowed with the charisms of leading and helping, who had to receive and administer the gifts, to perform the sacrificial service (if there were no prophets present), and take charge of the affairs of the Community." See also Selwyn, *The Christian Prophets*, 1900, and *St. Luke the Prophet*, 1901, who describes the prophet's method in the common session: "At this session he solemnly fell into a state of intense thought, Ecstasy, while collecting the materials of his utterance under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit" (*Luke the Prophet*, p. 25). Thus prophecy may be

It were much to be desired that more reverence were shown nowadays to the prophetic message, while at the same time more care were taken by the communities which are ministered to by such prophets as still keep up the tradition to subject their prophets to the discipline of the Spirit. What is wanted in all Churches of to-day is less organisation, more of the prophetic spirit to prevent prophets from overstepping the bounds of truth and charity, and a deeper recognition of the presence of the Spirit of God in those who speak as prophets in His name. In any case "belief in the Holy Ghost" includes a readiness to hear and to obey the message He sends by any prophet in our midst.

Prophecy, however, is not the only gift of the Spirit which has suffered eclipse. In 1 Cor. xii. appear "powers, gifts of healings, helps, governments, tongues." Of these, "helps" find their modern equivalent in the numerous body of devoted men and women—proportionately more numerous, perhaps, than they have been for 1500 years—who devote themselves, if not always in the name of Christ, but in His Spirit, to the care of the poor and the sick and the downtrodden. "Governments," too, fail not, even though neither in Church nor State can we always discern the leader of men who leads because he is called to it by the Spirit and humbly obeys the call. "Powers," however, have been for long out of fashion, and when they do appear it is not always easy at first to say whether they are from above or below. An age

---

defined as an utterance about sacred things inspired by the Holy Spirit and prepared for by silence and meditation. An interesting statement of the function of this inspiration will be found in Bergson, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, 1913, p. 76 f.

which is the inheritor of the traditions of two or three generations of men who worshipped Reason fondly, and put out their eyes as a sacrifice to their goddess, is also by the law of rhythm beset in the swing of the pendulum by a number of pretenders to supernatural powers who promise great things and mislead the unwary. The wise Christian will prove all things, without barring out works of wonder as impossible; but he will not attach too much importance to them, far less indeed than to holiness and love in common life.

Yet it is impossible to ignore the fact that the two decades last past have displayed a remarkable recrudescence of a claim to abnormal powers. Clairvoyance and clairaudience, levitation, psychometry, psychical intuitiveness, telepathy, and various forms of magic, have sprung up like mushrooms and won instant acceptance in certain circles. But observation of their phenomena has shown that they are due partly to dishonesty, much more to self-deception, and that they die away under the cold breath of cold criticism, while, on the other hand, there is reason for suspecting the existence of such powers among people to whom they are too sacred for expression in ordinary conversation. The former do not concern us under this Article, but it is the latter class, if any, which is to be attributed to the working of the Holy Spirit. It seems commonly forgotten that even supposing any of these gifts to be possessed they are but as a sixth sense, and that the true function of the Holy Spirit with regard to this sixth sense is to help us to use it dutifully in precisely the same way as in the case of the other five senses. Better a disciplined life without such abnormal powers than an undiscip-

lined life with them. The powers wherever they truly exist come, like all powers of all classes, from Him who is " the Lord and the Giver of Life," but when they are given they are given as a trust, and woe to the man who uses them for selfish ends. We must be, then, on the one side, careful not to allow any pre-conceptions or scepticism on our part to cause us to limit even in thought the powers the Spirit may see fit to bestow, and, on the other side, we must be equally careful to weigh the spirits and see whether they be airs from heaven or blasts from hell.

" Gifts of healings," again, have been emphasised in recent years, and the credit of their revival on a large scale can hardly be denied to the movement, if not inaugurated, at all events nursed into adolescence by Mrs. Eddy. So large a place has Christian Science taken in the public eye that whenever faith-healing is named men's thoughts go immediately towards this special kind. Yet faith-healing has never died out in the Christian Church, for not only are miraculous healings told almost as a matter of course of all mediaeval saints, but even in the coldness of Protestant times the tradition has been maintained by men like Glanvill, Valentine Greatrakes, John Wesley, and the Peculiar People, by Martin Luther, the Moravians, the German Pietists, and the English Quakers. The truth, therefore, about Christian Science seems to be that the power displayed in the cures which it indubitably performs is not peculiar to it, that is, is not "Christian Science" at all, but that what is its peculiar glory is the bad philosophy by which it seeks to set forth the power which comes from the Spirit and is under the guardianship of Religion.

Faith-healing sometimes is confused with so-called magnetic healing, in which "power" goes forth from the healer [1] and heals the patient under laws of which at present we are in entire ignorance. That such cures are effected in our midst to-day is beyond all doubt, but it is difficult to see how they can be regarded as more directly due to the Holy Spirit than cures effected in the ordinary way of medical practice. For they appear to be more physical than psychical in their nature, and to have no necessary connection with the saintliness of life which is the special fruit of the Holy Spirit. In a similar way, the numberless cures wrought by *suggestion*, whether made in hypnosis or given to the waking consciousness, are more psychical than spiritual, and are no testimony to the spiritual character of the operator. Again, it remains true that though the power of the suggester comes from the Spirit, yet it is a gift and not a grace, still less a fruit. The loyalty, obedience, and love which control the power are of infinitely greater consequence than the healing power itself, and these spiritual qualities, of course, may be as truly set forth in mending a pair of boots or sweeping a floor as in curing neurasthenia.[2]

The last of the gifts of the Spirit which seems alien to modern notions is that of tongues, and while there seems a general agreement that the gift is undesirable and had better be left where we find it, in the pages of history, yet it remains unsettled whether tongues were a gibberish of meaningless sounds, whether they dwelt in the

[1] Cf. Luke vi. 19, viii. 46.

[2] On this whole question of faith-healing see my article under that name in *Encycl. of Religion and Ethics*, vol. v., 1912.

tongue of the utterer or the ear of the hearer, or whether they were actual foreign languages not learned empirically but communicated intuitively, or were due to a kind of hypnotic suggestion. We venture to add one other suggestion which seems to cover the whole ground better than any of those just named, viz. that tongues were akin to prophetic utterances as being directly inspired, but differed from them in being more ecstatic, less subject to logic, more tropical and couched in greater obscurity of language. The difference between the two was the difference, say, between Blake and Watts, Boehme and William Law, Browning and Tennyson, Ezekiel and Isaiah. That tongues were not gibberish is shown by the fact that they were susceptible of interpretation ; [1] that they were not clear is stated when it is said that the unbeliever would not understand them ; [2] that they subserved a useful end is implied in the assertion that they were a sign to unbelievers.[3] They are best explained of rapturous or ecstatic utterance which used analogies, parables, difficult sentences, and all at white heat, and demanded, therefore, an audience already convinced, sympathetic, and capable of understanding with a little help from an interpreter. Some of us, perhaps, have listened to preachers of unquestionable saintliness whose sermons might well seem to belong to the department of "tongues," and we have gone away reflecting that after all the man was more than his message, that the Spirit was more truly discernible in what the man was than in what he said.

So far we have dealt with the relation of the Holy Spirit to those on whom he bestows His gifts,

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 27. [2] *V.* 23. [3] *V.* 22.

or graces, from whom He demands the fruit of spiritual living.[1] There is, however, another sphere of His activity which is directed toward the "world." The ethical or spiritual use of this world in the N.T. is almost peculiar to the writer of the Fourth Gospel among the Evangelists, and even with him it does not refer so much to the concrete persons who stand in opposition to the truth as to the inner spirit which makes them what they are. The thought about the men of this world passes over easily, as is to be expected, into thought about the spirit of this world. Hence when it is said that one of the functions of the Paraclete shall be to appear in the court of spiritual audience as the advocate representing the accused Christian inspiring him and pleading his cause; when it is also said that His function shall be not only defensive but offensive, because He shall bring a countercharge (and prove it) against the world; it is indifferent whether we interpret these statements of worldly men in the concrete or of the worldly spirit in the abstract. The latter is preferable, however, as being more profitable to the interpreter himself, for it is easier to acquiesce in a denunciation which is directed against others than in one which is levelled against a class of motives by which we are ourselves swayed. Thus no one is much affected by our Lord's invective uttered against scribes and Pharisees until he sees that the scribe and Pharisee are in himself, in his blind conservatism, self-sufficiency, worship of form and contempt for others. Similarly we hold it right and proper that the Spirit should convict the world, but the case is altered when the world is seen to be the serpent

[1] Gal. v. 22.

coiled up in our own bosom and loved by us as our own soul.

"He shall convict the world of sin." Sin, let us notice again,[1] is neither the vice which defiles the man, nor the crime which offends the community, but the wrongness of heart and will which denies God and brings in its train vice and crime in due season. Sin is Egoism, and Egoism is the last fault which a man is brought to admit to himself, because it is a spiritual colour-blindness. Just as a man who wears always green glasses, and is unaware that he wears them, sees everything green, and cannot know that things are not all green until something happens to make him question; and just as he has then to begin to distrust his own sight and to be taught better, so it is with the man who has slipped into the habit of regarding everything in its relation to himself. He cannot see things as they are; their meaning and their beauty and the variety of their relationship to other things escape his notice, are to him as if they did not exist; nor can he bring himself to see his error; another must do that by assaulting the very citadel of his ignorance. The outward course of events must be so directed as to make Egoism untenable as a source of satisfaction, and this process needs to be accompanied by an opening of the inner eye by which glimpses become possible of the falseness of the Egoistic postulate. The union of the two—the inner and the outer—is the condition precedent for repentance, if repentance be, as the N.T. throughout asserts that it is, not merely the cessation from certain evil actions, but a turning-round of the inner man from darkness to light, from the lie of

[1] Cf. p. 307.

Egoism to the truth of God, which is the Love of God. This process of conversion is the proper work of the Spirit, for though He disposes and uses external things as his chisel on the hard granite of self, yet since He has to deal with an image of God, which is, therefore, inwardly free, He must not trust to compulsion from without only, but must supplement that compulsion by the appeal of love from within. And He is able to do this seeing that as the Divine Spirit He dwells in man as man, as the stream runs in the river-bed. Man is susceptible of conversion to God because the germ of divinity was sown in him when He first became man. Of all men it is true that potentially or actually they are the temple of the Holy Ghost, and it is this great truth which makes it possible to convict the world-in-man of sin, for this is to awaken the potential and convert it into the actual.

"He shall convict the world of righteousness." Sin as it has just been defined is the worldly spirit which withholds itself from the Logos; now Righteousness is defined as consisting in a journeying to the Father and a consequent transmutation of meditation (*θεωρία*) into the direct vision of intuition.[1] Some definition of this kind is very

[1] Cf. the *θεωρεῖτε* of John xvi. 10 and xvi. 19 with the *ὄψεσθε* of the latter verse. The root idea of this chapter is that the Word has become flesh in order to rouse men to an effective knowledge of themselves. They have to learn what sin is, what righteousness is, and what judgment. When they have arrived at a particular stage of preparation they can be informed that the time of study, of thought, and meditation is now almost over, and in a short time (*μικρόν*) they shall *see*. But before that can be they must go through a process of new-birth which is painful, as are the birth pangs of an earthly mother, but the pain is more than compensated when the New-man is born into the world—the *καινὸν ἄνθρωπον* of Eph. iv. 24. Then a perfect community of life and action will be established between the Word of God and His disciples, and what they ask will be not the expression of their own independent desires, but the outcome of His Spirit energising in them—it will be *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου*.

much needed if we are to understand the specific nature of Christian righteousness as distinct from forensic, ethical, or theological. No doubt at the root of every use of the term righteousness lies the idea of being in the right, but what is *Right*? Amongst men we may define right as that which is recognised by law, or by equity, or by custom, which is unwritten law.[1] What it is right for us to do as members of a community is that which the community has agreed on as due from each to the other. The content of this right may and does vary, but the form of right remains the same, viz. the general recognition of certain actions which may *not* be done at another's cost.

But when we come to ask what is right before God the question is more difficult to answer. To do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly[2] is one definition; to have clean hands, a pure heart, and a true tongue is another;[3] to do to others what we would have them do to us is better still;[4] and best of all is "Love the Lord your God with all your heart and your neighbour as yourself."[5] "The only thing," says Lotze, "that is really good is that living Love that wills the blessedness of others,"[6] from which it follows that what is in accordance with that Living Love is religiously right, and what is not in accordance with it is wrong. The righteousness of God is then self-consistency, and the righteousness of man is con-

[1] "It is with capacities only that Nature endows us; a man's right is something which he first feels as a duty towards others, and hence regards as being also a duty owed to others by himself" (Lotze, *Microcosmus*, ii. 527).

[2] Micah vi. 8. [3] Ps. xxiv. 4. [4] Luke vi. 31.

[5] Mark xii. 30. [6] *Microcosmus*, ii. 721.

sistency with God.[1] But we are still left to find out what is and what is not in accordance with the Living Love of God, and one finger-post to direct us is that which points us to a journeying to God, and the substitution of open vision for seeing as in a mirror darkly. The Spirit's work is to convince the world that true righteousness is to be found in going to the Father, and in ceasing to speculate about the Way.[2]

This is a somewhat singular statement at first sight, not only because it substitutes an attitude of the soul for practical conduct, but because the course of conduct which is implied by the attitude moves still among the intellectual virtues rather than the practical.[3] But it is at all events consistent with the general view of the Fourth Gospel which regards sin as refusal to see the Light and to come to it, and escape from sin as caused by the Light shining in the hidden chambers of the heart.[4]

[1] The somewhat unfortunate rendering of δικαιοσύνη by *iustitia* is responsible for the comparatively low view of righteousness in God. His *iustitia* is not commutative but distributive only, "quae singulis quod sibi ad sui complementum spectat tribuere dicitur, ut inde universi ordo servetur" (*Summa*, I a, quae. xxi. art. 1). In the next it is defined as that "quae constituit ordinem in rebus conformem rationi sapientiae," which agrees with Lotze's if wisdom be replaced by love.

[2] John xvi. 10.

[3] I cannot agree with Dr. Sanday that "an intellectualism has been imported into his (the Fourth Evangelist's) language which is wholly foreign to it," or that "the 'enlightenment' of which the prologue speaks is of the character and will, and only in a very subordinate sense of the intellect; and the revelation of God is also the revelation of His will and character, and has nothing to do with metaphysical speculation" (*Contemporary Review*, October 1891, p. 542). The intellect in the Fourth Gospel is not subordinate but paramount, only it is not bare intellect, but intellect informed by mysticism and carrying in its womb the will.

[4] Nor is this contradicted, but only balanced by the converse statement that "if any one wills to do His will he shall get to know about the doctrine whether it is from God or whether I speak of myself" (John vii. 17), for the same demand is made here that the doctrine shall be first received, but there is added that the doctrine must then be put to the hazard of

First the vision, it is said, then the love of what is seen, then the attempt to actualise it, and lastly growth into the thing seen so that the subject and object become one.

But there is no real contradiction between the intellectual presentment of Truth and the practical reconstruction of it, for the two are co-operant parts of one single whole, and mutually complete one the other. Their relation is that of the two stages of imitation called by Professor Baldwin *projective* and *ejective*. In the first stage the imitator, say, a child, projects his own conscious acts towards the other person whose attraction he has felt already, and begins to train himself in the performance of those acts of that other person to which he feels drawn. Gradually he learns how to do those things for himself and then he ascribes to the other person his own experiences, or he ejects them. " Very many of the particular marks which I now call mine, when I think of myself, have had just this origin. I have first found them in my social environment, and by reason of my social and imitative disposition have transferred them to myself by trying to act as if they were true of me (projection), and so coming to find out that they are true of me (ejection). And, further, all the things I hope to learn, to acquire, to become, all—if I think of them in a way to have any clear thought of my possible future—are now, before I acquire them, possible elements of my thought of others, of the social ' alter,' or of what, considered generally, we may call the ' socius ' " [1]

action, and that when so tested a man will be in a position to know its origin and decide whether it is of God or man.

[1] *Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development*, p. 11.

What Professor Baldwin gives as the analysis of the acquisition of faculty in general covers the acquisition of moral and spiritual faculty. The first step is to see the Truth of God veiled, half-veiled, or unveiled in the world around us, and then to set ourselves by *projection* to imitate it by a life that models itself on it and tries to get on friendly terms with it. Next, imitation gradually creates a second nature akin to that of the Logos itself, so that now the acts of this new nature become spontaneous and are by *ejection* referred back to the Logos as our own acts as well as Its, and this interplay between the Self and the Logos continues until an eternal union of will and action has been established. That is to say, in the words of our Gospel, the world in our heart has become convinced that the true righteousness consists in imitating the life of the Logos as He journeys through Time to the Father from whom He came, and so learning by imitation to acquire that inner intuitive vision of the Good, the True, and the Beautiful which is the perfecting of that brooding meditation, or *θεωρία*, which is as vision in the making.

"He shall convict the world of judgment." The judgment, or testing, consists in the fact that the Prince of this world has been challenged and foiled already.[1] "This world" as opposed to

[1] Cf. also John xii. 31, xiv. 30. It is against the whole tenor of the Fourth Gospel to see in the "Prince of this world" physical death. "Der Fürst dieser Welt," says Kreyenbühl, "ist der *Tod* mit seinen Schrecknissen, den sich der Verfasser auf das Lebhafteste vergegenwärtigt" (*Das Evangelium der Wahrheit*, i. 666). Rather the death of the Fourth Gospel is, as generally in the N.T., not the physical death by which the spirit and soul of man on the one hand are severed from the body on the other, but the separation effected by Egoism between God on the one side and man's spirit and soul on the other. But the Prince who presides over this latter death is Satan.

" that world " [1] represents an order of things which is the reflection of the character of its personal ruler or ἄρχων the aeon of this world, the prince of the authority of the air of Eph. ii. 2. The Prince of " that world " on the contrary is the " Prince of Life," [2] the " Prince of the Kings of the earth." [3] The course of things suggests to nine men out of ten, and to all of us during nine-tenths of our waking hours, that the Prince of this world is in undisturbed possession, and history assures us that what we see around us has been always here, and hence all things continue to form one comprehensive suggestion—a *contagion mentale*—that any hope for a better order is without solid foundation, the offspring of discontented and disgruntled souls who would do better to make the best of " this world " and leave " that world " to look after itself. To this conclusion of Reason and robust common-sense there is opposed the still small voice of the Spirit of God which disturbs the complacency of the " world " within us, by its reminder that in Jesus and in His followers the Prince of this world has been not only ideally but actually dethroned. His power has been broken in the comparatively small area where the kingdom of heaven has been founded; but that area, let us bear in mind, is a growing area, intensively and extensively, as the trees of God planted in it strike their roots deeper and stretch out larger boughs. Indeed, if what has been said before [4] be in accordance with facts, why should we not say that in the return to this earth from time to time of

[1] The הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה and הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא of the Talmud, the ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος and ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων of the N.T. (Matt. xii. 32, Mark x. 30, Luke xviii. 30); cf. Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii. p. 177 ff.

[2] Ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς Acts iii. 15. [3] Rev. i. 5. [4] Pp. 124 ff.

souls which have begun to taste of the fruits of the tree of life is contained a pledge of the gradual extension of the powers of "that world," and that it is no mere dream which tells us that in due time the earth of man's unconverted nature shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea?[1]

Anyhow the pledge of the final victory of good over evil, of "that world" over "this world," of Christ over Satan, of love over egoism is to be found, however the result may be achieved, in the continuous activity of the Holy Spirit within us by which he dispels the clouds of our ignorance, changes despondency into confidence, sloth into strenuous spiritual endeavour, and gives us an assurance that the battle of life against spiritual death is well worth fighting, and that the victory won by others is within our reach also, if only we fight as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. Others have won, the Spirit reminds us, why not we? God has placed eternity in the heart of man;[2] therefore He will finally translate man into eternity. Meanwhile the Spirit is unweariedly engaged in His work of convincing the worldly heart that true righteousness consists in unceasing endeavour after the heavenly ideal.

Thus the work of the Holy Spirit may be summed up under two heads: He inspires those who belong in any sense to "that world"; He convicts of sin, righteousness, and impending doom those who belong to "this world."

[1] Isa. xi. 9, Hab. ii. 14.

[2] This is undoubtedly the sense of נָתַן בְּלִבָּם אֶת־הָעֹלָם in Eccles. iii. 11. The writer is thinking of Gen. i. 26, and he says that the likeness of man to God is established by the Divine being planted in man. "Das Göttliche im Menschen nennt er עֹלָם, *Ewigkeit* . . . d. i. das Streben und Vermögen sie sich vorzustellen, den Trieb, über das bruchstückartige Erkennen hinauszugelangen und die Ewigkeit mit seinem Wissen zu umspannen" (Wildeboer in *Kurzer Hand-Kommentar* in loco).

CHAPTER XX

THE NINTH ARTICLE—PART I

The Holy Catholic Church [1]

Εἰς [μίαν] ἁγίαν καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν

In the Shepherd of Hermas the prophet relates [2] how a certain woman saluted him in a vision out of the opened heaven while he was praying, and reproached him for his wickedness and then left him; then how after an interval there came to him an aged woman in a shining garment and explained to him that his continence and temperance and sincerity and innocence availed him nothing so long as he failed to turn his household to the Lord.[3] A year after he had another vision of this

[1] "We are bound to believe that there is one Holy Catholic Church; but with regard to the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity, we not only believe them, but also believe IN them; and hence when speaking of each dogma, we make use of a different form of expression professing to believe the holy, not IN the Holy Catholic Church" (*Catechism of the Council of Trent*, p. 79). There is not any shadow of a foundation for this distinction in the text or true meaning of the Creed itself, nor is the existence of the Church subject-matter for Faith. The conception of the Church has first been materialised, and then a distinction read into the Creed itself in order to justify a false gloss. It is the ideal Ecclesia which is the subject of the Article, and this is believed *in* because it is ideal. Zahn, therefore, is wrong in saying that we believe "a holy Church, Forgiveness of sins, Resurrection of the flesh." We believe *in* the Holy Ghost as being the Life of the Church, as bestowing forgiveness, and in bestowing resurrection. The emphasis is on the will rather than on the intellect, as throughout the rest of the Creed. [2] Vis. i. 1. 4. [3] Vis. i. 2. 3.

same aged woman,[1] who repeated her exhortation, after which in his sleep a youth appeared to Hermas and informed him that the aged woman was not the Sibyl, as he supposed, but the Church, and that she came as an aged woman because the Church was the first of all things to be created, and on her account the world was fashioned.[2] Later in the book the Shepherd says to Hermas that he wishes to show him what was shown to him by the holy spirit which spake with him in the form of the Church, "for the spirit is the Son of God"; [3] he does this by taking him to a lofty mountain and showing him a great tower in building, on which were engaged a large number of workmen under the superintendence of twelve maidens and six glorious youths. Finally, after trial, the tower is approved, and then it is declared to be the Church, and the twelve maidens in linen gowns to be "holy spirits," "powers of the Son of God"; [4] their names are given [5] as Faith, Continence, Power, Long-suffering, Sincerity, Innocence, Purity, Joy, Truth, Understanding, Concord, Love.

With this view of the Church as a heavenly being agrees 2 Clem. xiv.: "So then, brethren, if we do the will of God our Father we shall be of the Church, the primal spiritual Church which was created before the sun and moon. . . . I do not suppose that you know not that the living Church is the body of Christ (for the Scripture saith: 'God made man male and female; the male is Christ, the female the Church), and that the books and the apostles [belong to] not the Church that now is, but the Church which is from above. For it is spiritual as

[1] Vis. ii. 1. 3. [2] Vis. ii. 4. 1. [3] Sim. ix. 1. 1.
[4] Sim. ix. 13. 2. [5] Sim. ix. 15. 2.

is our Jesus, but is manifested in these last days to save us. But the Church being spiritual is manifested in the flesh of Christ, showing us that if any of us keep it [the Church] in the flesh, and do not corrupt it, he shall receive it in the holy spirit. For the flesh is the anti-type of the spirit; no one, therefore, who destroys the antitype shall be partaker of the original. So then, brethren, he says this, 'Keep the flesh, that ye may partake of the spirit.' Now, if we say that the flesh is the Church and the spirit Christ, surely he who insults the flesh insults the Church. Such a one shall be no partaker of the spirit which is Christ. Truly, great is the life and immortality which this flesh can partake of, that is, of the holy spirit which is joined to it, nor can any one declare, or utter, what the Lord has prepared for his chosen." [1]

It is difficult to mistake the kinship of this circle

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. 103, 325, is content to explain the pre-existence stated here as an ideal pre-existence, as "foreknown by God before the creation of the world," and he equates it with the description of Christ as the "first-born of all creation" and "the principle of the creation of God." We must, he suggests, remember that the Church is to be conceived as pre-existent quite as much as Christ, and treat the whole conception as being limited to a "religious view" of their objects. If Harnack means that foreknowledge by God is equivalent to an Idea in God, and that an Idea in God is the Reality of which the phenomenal is the shadow, we may agree with him. But his denial of any but a religious interest in these descriptions, and his assertion that they are "not introduced for the explanation of cosmological problems," but rest on "shifting conceptions of existence" make it clear that they have in his judgment but a logical, not a real, worth. The explanation is that Hermas and the author of 2 Clement find Reality in a different world from Harnack's. The values are reversed. Nor can we assent to Harnack's dictum that these descriptions "have absolutely nothing Hellenic in them but rather have their origin in the Apostolic tradition," unless we are prepared to make "Apostolic" cover "Gnostic." The fact, to which he himself draws attention, contradicts his conclusion. The Apologists, he says, made no use of it, but Clement Al. and the Gnostics and the Greeks held it fast. That is, the former, representing tradition, did not find the doctrine of pre-existence in their sources, but with the latter it was on its own ground.

of thought with the Gnostic. When, for example, Irenaeus tells us [1] that the Valentinians read out of the prologue of the Fourth Gospel the Ogdoad in two tetrads, viz. in the first, Father and Charis and Monogenes and Aletheia, and in the second Logos and Zoë and Anthropos and Ecclesia, the emergence of Ecclesia without textual authority can be accounted for only by such a preconceived system as meets us in Hermas and 2 Clement.[2] At the root of both lies the Hellenistic thought of the pre-existence of the Idea in God, and its subsequent enformation on earth, the Idea being not merely inert but Thought charged with Energy. This is expressed by Heraclitus in the saying, "Join together that which is whole and that which is not whole, that which agrees and that which disagrees, the concordant and the discordant: from All comes One and from One comes all." [3] On which the late Mr. James Adam comments: "Now what is this One which is at the same time Many, this Many which is at the same time One? What is the Unity in which all opposites are harmonised? Heraclitus himself gives the answer quite plainly in two fragments, 'It is God who is day and night, winter and summer, war and peace, satiety and hunger.' And again, 'To God all things are beautiful and good and right, but man believes that some things are wrong and others right.'" [4]

[1] i. 8. 5.

[2] Cf. C. Barth, *Die Interpretation des N.T. in der valentinianischen Gnosis*, 1911, p. 93.

[3] Frag. 59.

[4] *Vitality of Platonism*, 1911, p. 165. Professor Bergson says that the intellect "installs itself in the immutable, it posits only ideas. Yet becoming exists: it is a fact. How, then, having posited immutability alone shall we make change come forth from it?" (*Creative Evolution*, 1911, p. 333). But if the *heart* posit God as the living Energy in the Idea,

Without committing ourselves to any specific result of Gnostic interpretation, we may at any rate say that the interpretation of the N.T. as it stands is becoming more and more difficult for anybody who starts with the postulate that nowhere in the N. T. is the Gnostic outlook to be allowed expression.[1] The exact contrary, viz. that there is no book in it which does not betray Gnostic forces at work, is nearer to the facts. Fortunately Gnostic tendencies do not stand there in isolation, but are balanced by historical counterpoises and are regulated by the recognition of an all-embracing purpose of God in the salvation of man. But the method and the intellectual expression of that salvation can hardly be reached without the light that is thrown upon them by the system known as Gnostic.

Hence we shall not dismiss Hermas and 2 Clement summarily as deserving only the degradation they were subjected to when they were no longer read in the Christian assembly, but rather take their "pneumatic" character as illustrating the age of the prophet before it was finally ousted by that of the bishop. When we do this, we shall see that the doctrine concerning the Church—and not concerning the Church only—has been arrived

---

as the living cause of each phenomenon, then the difficulty vanishes, and the world of Becoming is seen to be the superabundant overflow of the Energy of the Being of God. Cf. Deussen, *Metaphysics*, 1909, p. 144.

[1] An illustration of this is offered by Dr. Swete's recent volume (*The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, 1912) in which, referring to 2 Clem., he says: "It is not easy to follow this preacher; his metaphors are mixed, and his thought is at times inconsequent" (p. 30). Similarly the doubt expressed on p. 33, whether Aristides (Apol. 15) "intends to represent the Holy Spirit as the Agent of the Conception," would not arise if the passage had been rightly translated (see p. 306, note, above) and set in the light of antecedent gnostic thought.

at by first intellectualising the pronouncements of the prophets, and then secondly by erecting the intellectual proposition so obtained into a dogma. Then, if we go a step further back, we shall have to admit that in the prophetic utterance was contained a human content as well as a dynamic of the Spirit, and that the human content cannot be separated from the influence of the surrounding Hellenism. If we apply St. Paul's dictum here that the psychical comes first and the spiritual second in historical development,[1] we shall say that the earlier Hellenistic philosophy (including the Corpus Hermeticum, the Orphic Hymns, the Stoic speculations, the Mithraic and other mystery-religions, and the whole corpus of syncretistic or Gnostic thought) was the psychical *prius*, and that it was the spiritual dynamic of the Lord Jesus Christ which raised Hellenistic strivings to the spiritual level. But in the ideal, or real, world it is the spiritual which comes first, and the psychical follows, partly as the degradation and partly as the necessary actualisation of the Idea, in order that the Idea and its historical form may together work towards the final purpose of God.

Hence further, if we are to be consistent in our spiritual interpretation of the Article on the Church, we must not start with the empirical Church, but with the Ideal Church as hid in God's foreknowledge, as, that is to say, possessing real existence in Him. In other words, 2 Clement and Hermas are better guides than, say, Cyprian or Tertullian, to anybody who desires to regard the Church *sub specie aeternitatis*. For just as the adjective "Catholic" was added in the Creed to the noun Church at a com-

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 46.

paratively late date,[1] so was the characterisation of the Church as a visible organisation an after-growth which imposed itself on an earlier and less concrete idea of the nature of the Church,[2] to which should be added the reflection that if this process from the ideal to the actual can be traced, and is admitted by competent authority in the case of one Article of the Creed, viz. in the use of the term *Catholic*, this affords a presumption that the remaining Articles have undergone the same process, by which a religious or mystical truth

[1] "The adjective 'catholic' in the article on the Church appears in the Creed as early as the fourth century and was very common from the fifth century on. The addition of the word was very natural, as the phrase 'Holy Catholic Church' was a current phrase. At the time when it was inserted in the Creed it had already acquired an exclusive meaning, and it was that meaning, therefore, which attached to it in the Creed, belief being expressed not in the holy church universal, but in the particular institution which was known as the Catholic Church and was distinguished from all schismatic and heretical bodies, the orthodox catholic church which was in communion with the see of Rome. The common Protestant interpretation of the article in the Creed which makes it refer to the holy church universal is therefore historically incorrect" (McGiffert's *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 32). With this historical judgment Zahn agrees, but he considers that the identification of the "truly universal Church with the Church on earth of that period together with her bishops and constitutions" was inadmissible (*The Apostles' Creed*, p. 184).

[2] "If we compare the Church about the middle of the third century with the condition of Christendom 150 or 200 years before, we shall find that there is now a real religious commonwealth, while at the earlier period there were only communities who believed in a heavenly Church, whose earthly image they were, endeavoured to give it expression with the simplest means, and lived in the future as strangers and pilgrims on the earth, hastening to meet the Kingdom of whose existence they had the surest guarantee. We now really find a new commonwealth, politically formed and equipped with fixed forms of all kinds. . . . We find a Church as a political union and worship institute, a formulated faith and a sacred learning" (Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma*, i. 45). Harnack holds that the presuppositions for this new order are to be sought in the Greek spirit which came into the Church with the Gentile converts and substituted, for example, for the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, both the concepts of ζωὴ αἰώνιος and of the ἐκκλησία, and for the Messiah the Divine Teacher and the Word manifest in the flesh (*ibid.* p. 51). It is quite possible that the reverse order is nearer the facts.

has hardened into a historic fact or a dogmatic proposition.

What, then, is the nature of this ideal Ecclesia which appears so abruptly and with such lofty claims in Hermas and 2 Clement? The Church, says the latter, is the flesh of Christ, a phrase which reminds us of Eph. i. 23, "the Church which is His Body," His fulness, *i.e.* which makes Him full or complete. In both passages the underlying idea is that the Church is that which expresses, or gives form to that inner Power which is called Christ. This can be none other than the company of the πνευματικοί, or spiritual men who have passed through the "third gate," and being united to the Lord are one spirit with Him. Hermas agrees with this in representing the Church under the image of a tower (otherwise a Domus, or a City of God) which is fashioned of living stones under the direction of twelve virtues, or holy spirits, or powers of the Son of God. It is the function of this "flesh of Christ" to lead to the spirit by which immortality is gained, and it is, therefore, to be kept or taken care of. But yet the Church is in some sense distinct from the flesh, for the Church is manifested in the flesh, and is to be kept or cared for in the flesh. It, therefore, pre-existed the flesh as Christ did, and was manifested in the flesh as Christ was. It was, therefore, some heavenly Being in close connection with Christ, making with Him a unity of complementary powers, such as is made by a marriage of sympneumata.[1]

We are thus directed to the well-known aeon-

[1] Ὡς γὰρ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔργον ἐστὶ καὶ τοῦτο κόσμος ὀνομάζεται, οὕτω καὶ τὸ βούλημα αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶ σωτηρία, καὶ τοῦτο ἐκκλησία κέκληται (Clem. Al. *Paidag.* i. 6. 27).

doctrine which has exercised as powerful an influence on Christian theology as its methods of influence have been obscure. In the system of the Barbelognostics, for example,[1] Logos and Ennoia, Christos, and Aphtharsia, Thelema and Zoë-aionios, Nous and Prognosis, Anthropos and Gnosis are all set forth, and may be all regarded as variant pairs of a primal divine duality.[2] Irenaeus adds, without any attempt to explain the connection, that " from the first angel who stands by the side of Monogenes the Holy Spirit proceeded whom they also term Sophia and Prunicus." This gives the independent pair of Monogenes and Sophia.

In the Valentinian Gnosis the primal pair is made up of Bythus and Sige from whom proceeds Nous who is also called Monogenes and Aletheia. Nous and Aletheia procreated Logos and Zoë and they Anthropos and Ecclesia. These make the supreme Ogdoad.[3] The difference between this scheme and that of Barbelognosticism is formal only. Both account for the origin of the world by postulating a series of pairs of emanations which are interchangeable because each stage of descent from the highest heaven is a precise reflection of the preceding. Hence it is immaterial whether

[1] Irenaeus, i. 29. 1.

[2] " Denn dass die *Ecclesia*, die Gemeinde der Pneumatiker, und die Gnosis im barbelognostischen System identisch sind, dürfte klar sein " (Bousset, *Die Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 1907, p. 164). Bousset's scheme identifies the four aeons proceeding from Christos and Aphtharsia and their four syzygies proceeding from Thelema and Zoë-Aionios with the four heavenly powers who uphold the four corners of the heaven ; it then assumes that at the head of the system was the triad of Father-of-all (Pure Light, or Primal-Man), Barbelo and Christ (Heavenly Man or Adamas) ; that then to Christ are added the three aeons of Nous, Logos and Thelema, and to Barbelo the four female aeons named above, making two sets of five syzygies. This is ingenious, but conjectural only.

[3] Iren. i. 1. 1.

we speak of Ennoia, or Aphtharsia, or Zoë, or Gnosis, or Aletheia, or Sophia, or Ecclesia. They are all similar, and are the super-sensual realities which have their counterparts "in ultimates," that is, on the physical plane. The gnostic-Christian, therefore, was one who, when such terms were used, instinctively referred them to the patterns of earthly things in the heavens.[1]

The cryptic expressions, then, of Hermas and 2 Clement, in which they describe the Church, become clear only when they are illustrated by the parable of the Sophia which occurs so frequently in early Christian literature. By Sophia were all things made,[2] and the earth founded;[3] the Lord created her as His ἀρχή;[4] she is a spirit of Jahweh;[5] she is the holy spirit from above;[6] she was present when the world was made,[7] and reacheth from one end to another mightily.[8] In the grossly misunderstood teaching of Simon Magnus divine wisdom was his companion.[9] It is quite easy to disentangle the truth from the ridiculous travesty of it which Irenaeus gives. Epiphanius tells us that Simon had the audacity to call his prostitute syzygy "a holy spirit"; and that she was called also Prunicus, and Barbero or Barbelo, and that by her he made the angels.[10] This Barbelo, or Sophia, or Heavenly Mother, is the supreme Deity on its mother-side. In the Valentinian system the supreme Triad was "the Father, Truth, and Man (ἄνθρωπος). This last had for his partner Ecclesia. The reason is obvious: to the ἄνθρωπος, who rises victoriously

[1] Heb. ix. 23.
[2] Ps. civ. 24.
[3] Prov. iii. 19.
[4] Prov. viii. 22.
[5] Isa. xi. 2.
[6] Wisd. ix. 17.
[7] Wisd. ix. 9.
[8] Wisd. viii. 1.
[9] Irenaeus, i. 23. 2.
[10] *Haer.* xxi. 2.

out of Matter, into which he had been plunged, belongs the community of the Spiritual which follows him on this path." [1]

But there is another chapter in the history of Sophia, which itself has apparently two sections. According to the system of Bardesanes, Light and Darkness, eternal Spirit and uncreated Matter stand opposed. The primary dualism of the Light principle is the Father and the Mother-of-Life (otherwise the Holy Spirit); from them proceed the Son-of-Life and his syzygy Sophia. But Sophia has a double on a lower plane, called Chakmut, or Achamoth, or the fallen Sophia, whose mission it is to mediate between the two kingdoms of Light and Darkness. She presides over the "seven" and the "twelve" as Mother, the seven of the Sun, Moon, and five planets, and the twelve signs of the Zodiac, *i.e.* over the moving (planetary) and the fixed world. These two worlds are under the jurisdiction of εἱμαρμένη, or Fate, or Necessity, while Achamoth belongs to the higher or spiritual world of the Ogdoad of Valentinus. The soul of man Bardesanes derived from the seven or from the Demuirge at their head, but man's spirit came from Achamoth. Hence, in accordance with the main current of Gnostic teaching, the work of redemption consists in rescuing the spiritual part of man from its imprisonment in matter, and for this the lofty Aeon Christ, or "the fruit of the Pleroma," Jesus, descended that He might rescue the "fallen" Sophia, and restore her to her place in the Ogdoad. This has its echo in the statement of Eph. i. 23, that the "Ecclesia" is the body of Christ which He quickens and raises to heavenly

[1] Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 1907, p. 340.

places,[1] and in that of 2 Clement that the Church is His flesh which is made living by partaking in His Spirit.[2]

Irenaeus [3] says that the Gnostics taught that the Demuirge made man so far as he was material and psychical, but that Achamoth without his knowledge implanted in man his spiritual principle. "This offspring they declare to be the Ecclesia, an emblem of the Ecclesia which is above. This then is the kind of man whom they conceive of: he has his animal soul from the Demuirge, his body from the earth, his fleshy part from matter, and his spiritual man from the mother, Achamoth." The *Pistis-Sophia* represents the Barbelo of the thirteenth Aeon as distinct from the fallen Sophia.[4]

As a rule, in Gnostic thought the second Sophia appears as a daughter, or sister of the first Sophia, the latter being the archetype of the former, and with the heavenly Sophia the Aeon Ἄνθρωπος is associated (for which, when the Gnostic system was sought to be adapted to the Christian life, Χριστός was substituted). The function of the Χριστός then becomes that of the Redeemer of the "fallen Sophia." The Ophites, according to Irenaeus,[5] maintained that Christ descended into this world and clothed first his sister Sophia (*i.e.* with the glory of the Light-world); that then both rejoiced together in their refreshment; and that this is (the marriage of) the Bride and Bridegroom." What follows as a description of the relation of

[1] Eph. ii. 6.

[2] xiv. 5. Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte*, 1884, pp. 519-522; Ephraem, *Hymn*, 51, 53.

[3] i. 5. 6.

[4] Schmidt, *Kopt. gnost. Schrif.* p. 234, 40, where is described how Jeû (ἄνθρωπος) drew from the invisible world the power which each planet required for its due working, that for Aphrodite being taken out of the Pistis, the Sophia, the daughter of Barbelo.

[5] i. 30. 12.

Christ, the Gnostic Redeemer, to Jesus, the redeeming God in Christianity, bears every mark of being an attempt to graft the Christian creed on the older Gnostic mythology.[1]

There is, however, apparently a second and somewhat different conception of the mode in which the second Sophia is made to do service in explaining the problem of Evil. According to this,[2] matter does not stand over against spirit as the cause of evil, but the Fall, under a monistic scheme of thought, is made to take place in the Pleroma itself. For the youngest Aeon of the dodecad which sprang from *Anthropos* and *Ecclesia* became the victim of an impatient desire to explore the mysterious secrets of the Father's nature, and was only prevented from being resolved through this desire into His absolute essence by another Aeon called Horos.[3] But a variant explanation makes this erring Sophia bring forth an amorphous substance (having no form, such as it was the function of Horos to supply), which was afterwards extruded from the Pleroma and fenced off by Horos. Later on,[4] Horos is given two functions, one of dividing and separating (the horizontal bar of the Cross), called properly Horos, and one of supporting and sustaining (the upright beam), called properly Stauros.[5]

[1] Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, p. 264.

[2] Irenaeus, i. 2. 2.

[3] This Horos or Boundary of the Pleroma is called by Hippolytus (*Ref.* vi. 26) Stauros, because "He is fixed inflexibly and inexorably, so that nothing of the Hysterema can come near the Aeons who are within the Pleroma." The Stauros, or Cross, had a celestial pre-existence as well as Ecclesia.

[4] i. 3. 5.

[5] The "Perfect Sermon" of the *Corpus Hermeticum*, xxx., says: "In the very life of the Aeon is the world moved, and in the living Aeon is the world-Space; therefore it will never stop or be destroyed for it is pallisaded round, and as it were bound together by the eternal Aeon." Cf. Bousset, *ubi supra*, p. 342.

It is not legitimate to seek to evade the influence of Gnostic thought on the Christian Creed by pointing to the supposed irresponsibility of Gnostic speculation. The day has gone by when Gnosticism was regarded as rationalism run mad.[1] It is now generally admitted that Gnosticism was not merely a philosophy (bizarre or otherwise), but was still more a religion.[2] Nor is its claim to respect weakened by the further fact that it was a mystery-religion, even though it suffered from the defects of its qualities, such as "looseness of organisation, petty sectarianism, and mystery-mongering." For these defects no more prove the falsity of the religion which suffered from them, than Catholicism is proved worthless by the rationalism of its scholastic theology, or the cruelty of its Inquisitions, or the inelasticity of its organisation. Moreover, in judging Gnosticism we must recollect that the greater part of its writings was destroyed by its ecclesiastical opponents, and we must be on our guard against supposing that the adverse opinions of Irenaeus, Hippolytus, or Epiphanius are of any value, or that they interpret correctly the extracts they give from Gnostic authorities — on the contrary, these extracts are the only valuable part of the works which contain them. The "Song of the Pearl," or "Hymn of the Soul," [3] alone is sufficient to show

[1] "Nothing more absurd than these (Gnostic speculations) has probably ever been imagined by rational beings. . . . By giving loose reins to their imagination, they built up the most incongruous and ridiculous systems; while by deserting the guidance of Scripture, they were betrayed into the most pernicious and extravagant errors" (*Ante-Nicene Christian Liby.*, 1868, vol. v. Pref.).

[2] "Most of the Gnostic schools know only one God, and put all emphasis on the knowledge of the oneness, supramundaneness, and spirituality of this God" (Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. 143).

[3] Ed. Bevan, *Texts and Studies*, v. 3 (1897).

that at all events some forms of Gnosticism were concerned less with speculation than with religion.

Anz has judged correctly on the Naasene Hymn as proving that "the Gnosis has a practical purpose, the redemption of man by showing him the way by which he may escape."[1] The escape that was necessary was from the world of Necessity, ruled by the seven Aeons of the seven planetary heavens, into the world of Freedom ruled over by the Ogdoad or Eighth Power. Gnosticism, unfortunately, however, underwent the same degeneration as Christianity. Both began as mystical, that is, as purely religious, and therefore individualistic; neither had at first any recognised authority capable of checking excesses; both then, under the stress of historic circumstances, developed along the line of least resistance, Gnosticism losing its mystery-character of practical discipline, and becoming theosophical; Christianity losing its mystical or prophetic character, and becoming under Imperial auspices an institution imperial in its form of government, rationalistic in its theology and dependent for its cult on folk-traditions. Already in the days of Justin and Irenaeus Gnosticism was decaying, and it is on this decadent stage, only half-understood, that the condemnation of Gnosticism ever since has rested.

Yet Gnosticism *victus victorem vicit.*[2] It

[1] *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus*, 1897, p. 10; Origen, *Contra Cels.* vi. 31, confirms this by the description he gives of the Ophites' teaching that the soul in its upward course has to pass through the seven doors of the seven heavens, and that its success is due to its possession of the necessary seven seals, or sacraments.

[2] Cf. Dante, *Paradiso*, xx. 98:

"Ma vince lei, perche vuole esse vinta
E vinta vince con sua beninanza;"

and Harnack: "It is no paradox to say that Gnosticism, which is just Hellenism, has in Catholicism obtained half a victory" (*History of Dogma*, i. 227).

succeeded in infusing its spirit into Christian thought, and the doctrine of the Trinity and the Christology of the Catholic Church were formed under the influence of pre-suppositions contained in the Gnostic thought of the syncretistic period which set in powerfully after the death of Alexander the Great.[1]

What Dr. Swete says of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit applies here with equal force: "It is imperative that any reconstruction or development that may be attempted by the theologians of our time be made in full view of the long history that lies behind the existing forms of belief."[2] But this "long history" does not start with Justin or 1 Clement; it reaches back through Gnosticism and the mystery-cults and Stoicism to Greek and Oriental thought and cult, and therefore it is impossible to interpret our Creed correctly unless this long pre-Christian history that lies behind it, which has helped to fashion it and still is implicit in it, be kept in full view.

When, then, we turn to Gnosticism with the view of finding what light, if any, it throws on the Christian doctrine of the Ecclesia, we shall do well to remember that its speculations so-called in general were rather of the nature of parables, whose object was not so much to form a system as to

[1] This applies also to the emphasis laid on the Sacraments as necessary to salvation; to the rise of the doctrine of Transubstantiation; to the cult of the θεοτόκος; to the septenary character of the Sacraments, Orders, virtues (three theological, four cardinal), deadly sins, and Spirits of God; to the claim to the possession of esoteric knowledge and an unwritten tradition; to purgatory, prayers for the dead, asceticism, indeed to a great part of the Catholic praxis. These were all adopted under Gnostic influence and employed in the service of religion. The substantive rejection of these at the Reformation was in the interest of politics rather than religion. See Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. 263.

[2] *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, 1912, p. 7.

illustrate the dualism of the phenomenal world; to trace it back to its source in the intelligible world; and to tell men how to escape from the world of the Many, which was under the rule of the Two, into the world of the One, which was brought into being and governed by the great and incomprehensible Propator, the Father of all that is, or exists. It was only later, when both Gnostics and Catholics alike perhaps had lost their savour, that the Gnostics were charged with "blasphemous and impious opinions," with being "wretched contrivers of audacious falsehoods," forgers, "miserable little foxes," "false persons, evil seducers, and hypocrites," from all of which the inference may be safely drawn that, on the one hand, the Gnostic teachers had given occasion for misunderstanding, and, on the other, the Catholic school had no capacity for sifting theosophic chaff from the mystic corn divinely sown.

Avoiding, then, the schematisation which Irenaeus rightly or wrongly attributed to his Gnostic opponents, we are on sure ground when we say that the many celestial pairs which the Gnostics found in the intelligible world were not so much graduated members of an orderly series as variant forms of that principle of Duality which governs our phenomenal world. Propator and Ennoia, Bythos and Sige, Nous and Aletheia, Logos and Zoë, Anthropos and Ecclesia, Christos and Sophia (or Christos and Holy Spirit) are of the nature of guesses at truth, convenient names for beings who were the heavenly side of obscured earthly facts. "They tell us that the Aeons were constituted equal to each other in form and feeling, so that all became as Nous, and Logos and Anthropos

and Christos. The female Aeons, too, became all as Aletheia and Zoë and Spiritus and Ecclesia." [1] This seems to say that the Truth as known here, the Zoë aionios which draws man onward and upward, the Spiritus which inspires him, and the Ecclesia which enfolds him, proceed from spiritual entities in the heavenly world, and so far from being separate and independent powers pass and re-pass the one into the other, so that it is one and the same thing which is revealed to man's Reason as Truth, to his Will as Life, to his feeling as Spiritus, and to his gregarious instinct as Ecclesia. The most favourite form for this one omnipresent power was Sophia or Wisdom, and it is this protean Sophia which Hermas and 2 Clement had in mind when they spoke of the Church being " the first of all things to be created, on whose account the world was fashioned," and of being a spiritual thing " manifested in the flesh of Christ," and being His flesh. They have in their minds the Gnostic conception of both Christ and Ecclesia as spiritual beings pre-existing in the unseen world, but manifested in these latter days, the one in the form of the historical personage Jesus Christ, and the other in the form of " die Gemeinde der Pneumatiker," the spiritual corporation of those who had passed through " the third gate which is the blessed Jesus," and so become the mystical body of the Christ who as the recapitulation of all the aeons filleth all in all.

This is the ideal Church which stands over against the empirical Church, and it is this ideal Church to which the Christian believer gives the assent of his thought and will when he says, " I

[1] Irenaeus, i. 2. 6.

believe in the holy, catholic Church." [1] Having done this he has still to face the problem of defining his attitude to the empirical Church with its claims on his obedience. The correctness of his definition must depend largely on his firm grasp, (*a*) of the nature of the ideal Church, and (*b*) of its relation to the empirical Church, and (*c*) of the law which forbids the latter to be more than an approximate representative of the former.

A. The ideal Church is not only the spiritual life of the empirical Church, but also of all civil institutions which rightly govern men. To take first the civil power. Unless the civil power first submits itself to the laws of eternal justice and makes them the basis of all its actions, it becomes an organised brigandage, a *grande latrocinium*. Its concern, however, is with *this* world, not with *that*; it exists in order to see that men live in communal life in harmony under law which is a reflection of the eternal Law, and it becomes a tyrant when it exceeds by a hair's-breadth this its appointed function. It may forbid crime, for *ex hypothesi* crime is against the Law of God as experimentally determined; it may levy taxes for common defence, or common internal benefits; but it may not transgress the bounds set to it of being the Keeper of the peace and the guardian of the security of the

[1] Harnack, speaking of the early days before Christian religion was spoiled by Greek philosophy, says: "The Church, considered in its origin, is the number of those chosen by God, the true Israel, nay, still more, the final purpose of God, for the world was created for its sake. There were in connection with these doctrines in the earliest period various speculations about the Church: it is a heavenly Aeon, is older than the world, was created by God at the beginning of things as a companion of the heavenly Christ. . . . The idea of a heavenly origin, and of a heavenly goal of the Church, was therefore an essential one, various and fluctuating as these speculations were" (*History of Dogma*, i. 152). But this is a precise account of Gnostic doctrine.

whole body.[1] Hence all interference with the liberty of the individual, over and above these two spheres of its action, is arbitrary and tyrannical, and being against the Law of God which makes the individual the end and not a means, it may be lawfully resisted.

We must, however, distinguish again here,[2] as neither St. Augustine nor Dante distinguished adequately, between the community and the State. The community is necessary to the perfection of the individual, and members of the community may and should exercise all their gifts of persuasion on one another for the higher and the better life, but to employ force to this end is to deny the inner freedom of this higher life of morality. Force belongs to the State which, whether organised as a monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy is not so much ordained as permitted because of the hardness of men's hearts, is therefore always an evil, and may not boast of holding its commission direct from God, but should act when it does employ force with shamefastness and reluctance, and only when it is clearly inevitable. That is to say, that while the community may be rightly described as a moral entity, the State is at best only concerned indirectly and partially with morality: indirectly because though morality may result from its action, yet it employs an immoral, or at best non-moral, instrument, viz. force, in its production; and partially, because the sole virtue with which the State as such is concerned is justice, and that not so much retributive as commutative.

[1] Γινομένη μὲν τοῦ ζῆν ἕνεκα, οὖσα δὲ τοῦ εὖ ζῆν (Arist. *Pol.* i. 2. 8. The "living well" here is living in accordance with right Reason, with that eternal Goodness which manifests itself in Kant's "categorical Imperative."

[2] See p. 181 above.

This important distinction between the State and the community calls for recognition also when we are analysing the nature of the empirical Church. For just as the community is a moral entity in so far as it sets out by moral means its own growing moral powers, while the State is not a moral entity in itself, but an excrescence of the nature of a cancer which witnesses to some aberrant life-activity in the organism, so is the empirical Church a spiritual entity so far as its members assert by appropriate methods their spiritual life, while ecclesiastical authority which compels obedience, is always a mark of imperfection, a standing confession that the community it exercises its action upon is so far not spiritual but carnal, demanding the carnal weapon of force. If the claim of the State to hold its commission direct from God is inadmissible in the face of the fact that the State is permitted only because of existing evil, so is it impossible to suppose that Jesus Christ, as the Word of God, clothed any ecclesiastical authority with coercive jurisdiction in matters either of faith or morals. In so far as ecclesiastical authority, with or without the co-operation of the State, has sought to compel heretics to yield to its orthodoxy, to command Kings, or to enforce common worship or a common faith by Acts of Uniformity, it has surrendered to the Prince of this world and confessed its own sub-Christian belief that spiritual ends are not secured by spiritual means. In so far as it trusts to canons, the King's ecclesiastical law, or to canon law in general, or even feels impelled to set these in action, it is acting as a civil institution, not as a spiritual community, and though it may properly plead that its action is necessary, yet it should take shame to

itself for the necessity. It is not easy to recall to mind any case, however, in which this necessity might not have been avoided by the exercise of charity, sympathy, and humour on both sides.

Unless, then, the true nature of the ideal Church be persistently kept in mind as constitutive of the empirical Church, this latter will inevitably sink into a bad copy of a bad thing—it will seek to emulate the State, and in all likelihood will exaggerate the evil which is inherent in the State, by becoming even more intolerant and more vindictive.

B. What then should be the relation of the empirical Church to the ideal Church? Whatever form the answer to this question may take, it must recognise that the two Churches belong to two different classifications of worth. The ideal Church has its home and working in the inner world of Freedom, where words like Necessity and Compulsion must undergo a radical re-interpretation before they can be legitimised; where Life is its own law, and is by its own inherent power sacrosanct against every intruder. The empirical Church, on the other hand, is an attempt made with varying degrees of unsuccess to establish a religious institution which may reflect the living Truth and Holiness of the Church which is in the heavens.[1] Such a Church undertakes a task of no small difficulty, because while it must keep one eye on the ideal it

[1] "In throwing a protective covering round the Gospel, Catholicism also obscured it. . . . It permitted the genesis of a Church, which was no longer a communion of faith, hope, and discipline, but a political commonwealth in which the Gospel merely had a place beside other things. . . . Catholic Christianity discovered the formula which reconciled faith and knowledge. This formula satisfied humanity for centuries, and the blessed effects which it accomplished continued to operate even after it had itself already become a fetter" (Harnack, *History of Dogma*, ii. 4).

is seeking to actualise, it must at the same time not lose touch with the possible. If it loses touch with the ideal, it ceases to be a Church in any sense of the word; while if it aims too high, and seeks to overleap the boundaries which Time sets to evolution, and ignores the capacity of human nature under existing conditions, it becomes unpractical, impatient, and supercilious. The Anglican Church after the Restoration may exemplify the former, and the Fifth-monarchy men of the Commonwealth the latter.

It is easy to trace at least some of the steps which led historically the evangelical strictness of the early Church to the laxity of Calixtus, and so to what was practically a state of Church order which was in conflict with the original. Had the earlier view prevailed, the Church would have remained pure but of restricted influence; the Catholic conception illustrates Bacon's remark that alloy debases the sovereign but makes it work the better. It is impossible not to see that the change "depotentiated" the Church, while admitting that the bishops carried out the secularising process with "wisdom, foresight, and comparative strictness." It was the Novatians who fought for the older conception, as the Montanists did before them and monks and friars after them; they all "opposed the naturalisation of their religion in the world, and the transformation of the Church into a political commonwealth." The truth seems to be with both parties. The Novatians fought for the ideal Church; the Catholics sought to give it form; but neither sought to reconcile the difference by a theory of an invisible Church within the visible.[1]

On the one side, then, the empirical Church must

[1] Cf. Harnack, *ubi supra*, ii. 113-123.

not act on the assumption that it is identical with the ideal Church, or has any title to that finality of authority which belongs to this latter. It may claim, no doubt, that in the person of its head, its officers, and its members it is in the habit of living in such intimacy with the ideal Church that when it speaks it speaks with the authority of its heavenly counterpart, but even so it will have to speak modestly and with reserve, and also admit that its authority is of the moral order only, and carries with it no right of compulsion. If this limited character of ecclesiastical authority be allowed, it is somewhat difficult to view with equanimity the claims made persistently by the Papal Curia in the name of the Unseen to compel private persons and rulers and nations to obey its decrees on pain of war, interdict, or the funeral pyre. In so far as it has taken up the weapon of force it has abandoned its religious character, and in so far as it has claimed infallibility for itself (as it has done for 1500 years) it has confounded the distinction between the ideal Church and the empirical Church.

If the ecclesiastic has erred in sinking the ideal in the actual, on the other side, the fanatic errs in ignoring the actual in presence of his vision of its ideal.[1] And both have agreed in using Force when they could not attain their ends without it. If Clement VIII. burnt Giordano Bruno, Calvin burned

[1] "What resources have they left but to assert that the kingdom of heaven itself belongs to the present life in which we now are? For why should not this blind presumption proceed to this madness also? And what could be more senseless than such an assertion? For although even the Church now existing is sometimes called the kingdom of the heavens, it is of course so called because it is being gathered for the future and eternal life" (St. Augustine, *De Virgin.* xxiv.). The doctrine of an aeonian Church pre-existent in the heavens into which the Church on earth shall be gathered in the future is needed to complete St. Augustine's thought.

Servetus, and on the same principle—that Truth is too feeble to maintain itself if its enemies are not reduced by Force.[1] We seem slow to learn the lesson that no power but that of moral life itself can maintain a moral standard, and that attempts to establish by Force a standard much in advance of that which has been reached already can but throw back the onward march of the moral life. God never hurries, never interferes, but also He never ceases His persuasive activity, and our wisdom is to make our methods square with His, follow His patience, show His tolerance, and constantly press forward as quietly as He.

C. From what has been just said it follows that to expect the perfection of the ideal Church in any one of the existing Churches is a blunder of the first magnitude. We hear from time to time of the transfer of individuals on their own responsibility from one Church to another, and we may fairly suspect that the attraction is of a negative character, that is, that the convert is not so much attracted by the virtues of the Church he is seeking to join as repelled by the failings of that which he is renouncing. But to act under such an impulse is not merely a blunder; it is a sin against light. Nowhere does God promise faultlessness to any empirical Church; the only Church which is without spot or wrinkle or any such thing is the ideal Church, or the empirical Church when it shall have ultimately merged itself into the ideal. "Infallible authority belongs to the Church in that degree in which knowledge of Reality is possible to man:

[1] We are reminded again of Professor Thorold Rogers's reply to an ecclesiastic who had remarked that you must support religion by force, or there would be no religion, that he saw no difference between the two.

it is her ideal attribute; but the Church as known to us is but the visible shadow of the *civitas superna.* She has truth, trustworthy for all practical purposes, *Catholica veritas,* but never in the sense that it is accessible to the bare-handed grasp of reason; never as *ultimate* truth. *Credo ut intelligam* is the ideal order, but is never adequately realisable in this life. Here the Church, collectively and in all her members, is and remains a *seeker.*"[1] We need not deny that God does sometimes call His servants to come out of the Church of their fathers, and enrol themselves in another, but the presumption should always be that it is not His Spirit, but the False Light which is calling an unstable soul, and that presumption should be allowed to hold the field until expelled by the unquestionable hand of God.

So too isolation, or aloofness from an empirical Church of some sort, is seldom safe, and is nearly always a mark of a subtle spiritual pride. To be able to find no Church between the Roman Catholic and the Plymouth Brethren which satisfies my demands is a pleasing proof that my religious standard is high, higher indeed than that of my neighbours, and I feel justified, therefore, as an egoist in holding aloof from their religious society.

"And now since this False Light is nature, it possesseth the property of nature, which is to intend and seek itself and its own in all things, and what may be most expedient, easy and pleasant to nature and itself. And because it is deceived, it imagineth and proclaimeth it to be best that each should seek and do what is best for himself. It refuseth also

[1] A. Robertson, *Regnum Dei,* 1901, p. 217.

to take knowledge of any Good but its own, that which it vainly fancieth to be Good. . . . Briefly, this false and deceived Light fleeth all that is harsh and contrary to nature, for this belongeth to it, seeing that it is nature. And seeing also that it is so utterly deceived as to dream that it is God, it were ready to swear by all that is holy, that it knoweth truly what is best, and that both in belief and practice it hath reached the very summit." [1]

In the empirical Church good and bad are intermixed, the bad that they may be taught by the good, the good that they may be disciplined by the bad. Hence, even assuming a man's goodness, we may not permit him to escape from the salutary discipline of life in common with those possessed of less goodness, but must insist on the duty of his taking his part with them that he may fulfil the law of Christ.[2] In order to " get beyond all virtue, all custom and order, all law, precepts and seemliness," we must submit ourselves to them, and to those whose office it is to impress these things on us, even as Christ took upon Him the form of a slave and was made a minister of the circumcision.[3] Else have we no title to be led by the Spirit of God, and to need not that any should teach us. In the religious life man must enter its temple with bowed head, must stoop to rise, and learn that humility springs up only when Egoism is weeded out, and that Egoism needs the discipline of common life to keep it under and transmute it into the red-rose of Love's garden. We must accept our place in the

[1] *Theologia Germanica*, ch. xl.

[2] " To a false individualism not government but brotherhood is the true antithesis " (Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, p. 370).

[3] Rom. xv. 8.

Church as it actually is, not claim to be nearer perfection than others, judge no man, but do the best we can, and make it our one aim to be worthy some day of a place in the ideal Church, the New Jerusalem which cometh down from above.

CHAPTER XXI

THE NINTH ARTICLE—PART II

The Church (*continued*)

Πιστεύω εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν ἀποστολικὴν καὶ καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν[1]

THE "Four Notes" of the Church, "One," "Holy," "Catholic," "Apostolic," have grown out of the living experience of the visible Church—partly out of the influence of the earlier Church of Judaism, partly out of reflection on the characteristic phenomena of the Church itself, and partly out of the controversies in which it was engaged. That the epithet of "holy" is the most salient of the four "Notes" is evident from the fact that it was the earliest to appear, while the three others emerge gradually as the Church's self-assertion against the separative tendencies which it had to combat. But even the appearance of the Article on the Church in the Creed was itself late (probably about the middle of the third century), while it was during the following century that emphasis on the unity, the universality, and apostolic character of the Church was felt to be necessary.

Unless, however, we are to hold that the Chris-

[1] Council of Constant, A.D. 381.

tians of the third and fourth centuries were heedless of facts and substituted for them their hopes, it is impossible to believe that it was the stress of controversy alone which brought forth just these four "Notes." And if we do maintain that they were asserting not so much what was, but what they thought ought to be, it is but a short step to maintaining that the ideal Church they had in their minds and desired to see manifested was already in existence in the ideal world of causes, waiting only for the happy hour when the actual should correspond to the ideal. Further, it is not an act of faith to believe that the Church as it actually is in any given age realises the characters named in the four Notes, but it is rather a conclusion of the reason based on facts of observation, and the power to draw such a conclusion has only an indirect relation to the moral or spiritual character of the observer, whereas Faith is so closely interwoven with moral and spiritual excellence as to be often indistinguishable from it. "It cannot be an article of faith to believe the palpable fact that the local communities, whose Bishops were a Polycarp or an Augustine, possessed the same confessions as the large Christian communities of other towns and lands, and were in communion with them."[1] Similarly, we may say that it cannot be an article of Faith that the visible Church is one (except in an ideal sense), seeing that the actual facts are all on the contrary side; and even if the facts were on the side of the visible unity of the Church, we should be as far as ever from an act of Faith, for Faith deals with the things that are unseen.

Again, it is an act of Faith which makes us cling

[1] Zahn, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 184.

to the belief that the Church in heaven is "holy," but it is an act of reason which makes us apply the same adjective to the empirical Church. Whether the actual Church is also "catholic" in any historical sense is again matter of inference, not of Faith, as is the assertion that it is historically dependent on the Apostles for its foundation, its authority, and the purity of its doctrine. But as the *Apostles' Creed* is a document which, as we have seen, appeals to our Faith and not to our reason, except indirectly and secondarily, therefore we must, in the first place at least, interpret these four "Notes" by their reference to the ideal Church, and enquire in what sense that Church is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic.

Εἰς μίαν Ἐκκλησίαν

The importance of the note of unity may be gauged from the fact that all Christian communities do it homage. The Lambeth Conference of 1888 adopted the following resolution:

> That this Conference earnestly requests the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion, acting, so far as may be, in concert with one another, to make it known that *they hold themselves in readiness* to enter into brotherly conference (such as that which has already been proposed by the Church in the United States of America) with the representatives of other Christian Communions in the English-speaking races, in order to consider what steps can be taken, either towards corporate reunion, or towards such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter.

The Lambeth Conference of 1897 adopted the above resolution, and added:

We consider, however, that the time has now arrived in which the constituted authorities of the various Churches of our Communion should not merely make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with representatives of other Christian Communities in the English-speaking races, but should themselves *originate such conferences and especially arrange for representative meetings for united humiliation and intercession.*

The Lambeth Conference of 1888 (endorsed again by that of 1897) specified four Articles which might supply a basis on which Home Reunion might be built, viz. (1) the Holy Scriptures; (2) the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal Symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith; (3) the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself; and (4) the Historic Episcopate.

It should be noticed that the Roman Church as well as the Eastern Churches are expressly excluded from these proposals;[1] and that the unity that is desired is stated to be "organic," because of the "grievous injury which has been done to Christianity by the separations which part holy men and women of various Christian bodies from each other."

It is instructive to notice, on the other hand, the

[1] The Eastern Churches were left out of account because of the want of assured knowledge of their attitude, and of the terms they might lay down as the basis of reunion, but the Latin Communion came in for more decided judgment. "The Committee (of 1897) with deep regret felt that, under present conditions, it was useless to consider the question of Reunion with our brethren of the Roman Church, being painfully aware that any proposal for reunion would be entertained by the authorities of that Church only on condition of a complete submission on our part to those claims of absolute authority and the acceptance of those other errors, both in doctrine and in discipline, against which, in faithfulness to God's Holy Word, and to the true principles of His Church, we have been for three centuries bound to protest." Perhaps the best thing said by the Conference was its quotation of Jeremy Taylor's words: May He grant us "uniting principles, reconciled hearts, and an external communion in His own good season."

attitude towards reunion taken up by the Roman Church. Leo XIII. in an Encyclical Letter, dated June 29, 1896, issued as a sequel to the letter "Ad Anglos," argues that Jesus Christ "ordained in His Church a Unity of Faith; that He did not trust the Scriptures only to secure this Unity but left 'another principle' in the living, authoritative, and permanent *magisterium* of the Church," which has always "regarded as rebels and expelled from the ranks of her children all who held beliefs on any point of doctrine different from her own"; this supreme authority Christ must have given to His Church, and He gave it to St. Peter, and to St. Peter's successors. Therefore, "the holy Roman Church possesses the sovereign and plenary primacy and authority over the whole Catholic Church, which, truly and humbly, it acknowledges to have received together with the plenitude of power from the Lord Himself in the person of St. Peter, the Prince or Head of the Apostles, of whom the Roman Pontiff is the successor." From all this it follows quite naturally that the only appeal for unity from the Pope must take the form of an invitation to submission. "Let all those, therefore, who detest the widespread irreligion of our times, and acknowledge and confess Jesus Christ to be the Son of God and the Saviour of the human race, but who have wandered away far from the Spouse, listen to Our voice. Let them not refuse to obey Our paternal charity." Leo XIII. in these words is but faithfully re-echoing the traditional sentiments of his Church; witness, for example, the similar claim of Pius V. in the Bull, *Regnans in excelsis*: "He that reigneth on high, to whom is ascribed all power both in heaven and earth, hath committed the

absolute government of his One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, outside of which there is no salvation, to one only upon earth, namely to Peter, the Chief of the Apostles, and to Peter's successor, the Bishop of Rome."

In 1895 was published a "Reply of the Holy Catholic and Apostolical Orthodox Church of the East to the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. on Reunion," in which a different basis for reunion from that put forth by the Anglican Communion, or that by the Latin Communion, was proposed, viz. "the teaching of the Gospel and of the Seven, Holy Oecumenical Councils." The claims of the Pope were met by the declaration that "the Roman Church of the day is the Church of innovations, of the misinterpretation of Holy Writ, of the falsification of the works of the Fathers, and of the corruption of the Acts of the Councils." It was the "evil one who . . . breathed into the bishops of Rome thoughts of overweening arrogance, which gave birth to divers innovations"; and caused her to "sow scandal by means of deceitful workers transforming themselves into apostles of Christ," and to make "use of other guileful devices in order to further her proselytizing pursuits." Hence the Patriarch of Constantinople and his Church meet the Pope's appeal for submission by accusing him of heresy and schism, and by calling on him to return to antiquity and abjure his innovations and false claims.

These official documents of the three great Churches have been quoted in order to show what are the reasons which animate their spokesmen in seeking for reunion. The Anglican states its terms to the nonconforming bodies around it, the Roman to the Anglican, and the Eastern to the Roman, but the

response is either nothing, or is hostile in each case. But one point is common to all. They are all looking for an outward and visible unity, an "organic unity," one which may be seen and known of all men, and be proved to be a real unity by formal acts of the consenting Churches. What, however, does not seem to have been put forward is the view that unity does not belong properly to the formal side of things at all, but is a function of the spiritual and the spiritual alone.

For duality, that is, division, and the clashing of opposites are the very foundation-law of the phenomenal order. The world of Becoming cannot even be known except under the law of subject and object. Sensation and perception must unite before cognition is possible; thought and will are inseparable but defy identification. Life without form is unknown and unthinkable. Man and woman cannot escape from one another, any more than the individual and the community. There is not likely to be a time when Church and State, force and love, will cease to be opposed, or when science and art can be divorced without loss. Every here implies a there, every future a past, every above a below, every effect a cause, every pain a pleasure, every failure a success, and every heaven a hell.[1] Lotze

[1] Πάντα δισσὰ ἓν κατέναντι τοῦ ἑνὸς καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲν ἐκλιπόν (Ecclus. xlii. 24, where the A.V. hardly brings out the antithesis). Pythagoras had a saying, "Eat not on a chariot-board" (ἐπὶ δίφρου, on which two could stand), that is, apparently, seek thy soul's health in the One, not in the duad. So Thoth was "Judge of the two Combatant Gods, Horus and Set. Heracleitus made Discord and Love the originating cause of all things." Cf. Lotze: "The contrast between corporeal and mental existence may not be final and irreconcilable—only our present life is passed in a world where it has not yet been resolved, but yawning underlies all the relations of our thinking and acting. And, even as it will always be indispensable to life, it is, at present at least, indispensable to science" (*Microcosmus*, i. 467).

in an eloquent passage states admirably the relation of the One and the Two in our present life. "To us at all times the world of forms seems too much to conceal the world of values, the realm of means to eclipse the realm of ends; we long for the unity of truest being, in which the ideas have reality without being tied to the mediation of instruments, . . . in which immediate understanding between minds makes all external modes of reciprocal action superfluous; in which finally Creator and created blend in a community of life, for whose dim profundity the noblest mysticism scarce offers adequate expression. . . . But, far as we are from denying the truth of the *unity* which this mystic ecstasy thinks it discerns, this earthly life of ours assuredly lies, not in *its* sphere, but in that of duality and contrast." [1]

If, then, duality is the hall-mark of the empirical order, then the visible Church, as part of the visible order, must be content to bear this mark, and not strive to escape from its limits through any desire, no matter how pure, for the One in which all differences are resolved. The One is assuredly to be sought for above all things, for He is the object of the mystic quest, but in the search the Two are not to be contemned, but honoured as the outpoured manifestation of the One to our senses and reason. God "known of the heart" is One, but God approached through the head is Two. His Name, which we are bidden to learn to hallow, is all that manifests Him in His world, and its plurality, when carefully analysed, ranges itself into two camps which are rather complementary than hostile.

From this duality which attaches to the world of

[1] *Microcosmus*, i. 400.

Form seems then to flow naturally the exclusion of unity *as to be found there.* God is One, but His world is Two, and in it, therefore, as such unity is not to be found. Hence the unity of His Church is not to be found in anything tangible, or recognisable in ordinary consciousness; not in a single authority, such as that lauded by the Popes, not in acceptance of the decrees of a selected period of Conciliar activity, not in agreed-on terms of "organic unity," not indeed in anything but in the domain of the spiritual. For it is Life as Love which unites, it is Intellect which divides, and both have their appointed place, which they should each be allowed to keep without confusion as without conflict. The world of Form is the world of mechanism; the world of Life is the world of purpose, and the two are necessary the one to the other.

The reunion of Christendom, however, in the minds of its champions seems to ignore this distinction, and to be based on an illegitimate levelling of formal distinctions, instead of on an independent service of the common Life of God in which alone unity is to be found. It is not too much to say that where that Life is the dominant force in any Church there the unifying force of the Universe is already at work, and that therefore any difference of organisation, or any separation in space or time, is a matter of indifference, and is even to be welcomed as affording that variety which is as necessary to the beauty of the whole as is the unity of the life-force. Of the three official pronouncements on the subject of Reunion quoted above, it must be admitted that that of the Anglican Communion is more in accordance with the cosmic law which

demands both variety and unity. "Quid autem amo," says St. Augustine, addressing his God, "cum te amo? non speciem corporis nec decus temporis, non candorem lucis ecce istum amicum oculis, non dulces melodias cantilenarum omnimodarum, non florum et unguentorum et aromatum suaviolentiam, non manna et mella, non membra acceptabilia carnis amplexibus: non haec amo, cum amo deum meum."[1] Similarly we may say that when we love God we are laying the foundation of Church reunion whether we know it or not, and that when we love the creature for itself we are fomenting disunion. Hence union is the fruit of the love of God, and has no root in a uniformity of outward organisation.

This relation of the multeity of forms to the unity of life may be illustrated from a sphere which offers at once the battle-ground for the problems of philosophy and the materials for their solution, viz. the consciousness of man. So long as our ideas are regarded as so many independent things standing one by one over against an impassive outer Reality, or as successive states of our inner being caused (without being valid) by immediate contact with a Reality that eludes our grasp, or as universals making thinking possible, all unity or approach to unity is barred. But when the conative impulse in its living unity comes with its selective, and therefore exclusive, activity to weld into one the complex of neural and psychical dispositions which else had remained a chaos, then the problem of how the Many may become the One which pure Thought finds insoluble is solved, and any inner act by which the outer Many become the inner One

[1] *Conf.* x. 6.

is symbolical of the similar act by which the world is subsumed in the unity of God. So the will of the Spirit in the Church seizes the separate minds of its members, and makes them into that living whole which can never be the product of a mere collective assertion that outer forms must be abolished or merged if outward reunion is to be attained. Unity, to which union is ancillary, is of Life rather than of form.[1]

Εἰς ἁγίαν Ἐκκλησίαν

In Hebrew two words are used for *saint*, קָדוֹשׁ and חָסִיד, rendered in Greek by ἅγιος and ὅσιος respectively. In their plural forms they represent, the former, those called into covenant relation with God, and the latter, those whose piety is the fitting correlative to that call. In the O.T. therefore οἱ ἅγιοι is the name of the Jews as being called by

[1] "The world as a whole is an individual fact, not merely by virtue of the completeness of the contents of the Absolute Experience, but by reason of the definiteness of the selection of that object which shall be permitted to fulfil the final meaning. No significant purpose, no element of meaning that finite ideas demand as necessary for their own fulfilment, could indeed be wholly ignored from the absolute point of view. But, on the other hand, the very perfection of the fulfilment would logically require of the divine will the sort of determination of purpose of which we too are conscious when we deal with the objects of the exclusive affection. It is will, then, in God and in man that logically determines the consciousness of individuality. The individual is primarily the object and expression of an exclusive interest, of a determinate selection. From this point of view, the world in its wholeness might indeed be regarded as, so to speak, an only-begotten son of the central purpose—an unique expression—unique not merely by reason of its wealth, but of its exclusiveness. And thus the category of individuality would be fulfilled in the whole precisely in the sense in which a finite affection presupposes its fulfilment in individual cases" (Royce, *The World and the Individual*, 1900, p. 459). Cf. Bradley: "Thinking is the attempt to satisfy a special impulse, and the attempt implies an assumption about reality" (*Appearance and Reality*, 1893, p. 153).

God's special favour to be His peculiar people, while in the N.T. it represents Christians as having stepped by individual selection into the place vacated by the Jewish Church and nation.[1] In both the O.T. and the N.T. the objective character of the word is maintained in accordance with the indispensable note of all genuine religion which emphasises the act of God as the decisive factor and man's piety as the natural sequel of God's grace. For the same reason the title οἱ ὅσιοι falls into the background in the O.T. and almost disappears in the N.T. Christians are specifically such, as being " saints by way of call " rather than of hereditary privilege, and certainly not as contributing anything to win their position. Piety, penitence, righteousness, and holiness are regarded as the natural response in the believer to the gracious calling of God, but the relationship is never reversed.

It is in this sense that the *Ecclesia* is called *holy*. It, like the Jewish Church, is a creation of God, and is therefore a separate or consecrated thing, belonging to the eternal order properly and to the phenomenal order secondarily only. In this latter capacity it exhibits every mark of imperfection, and its members are warned against every sin that man is guilty of, while yet it is implied that their sinfulness does not destroy their calling. On the contrary, the normal process of salvation, while starting from God's act of choice, allows of the continuance of sin which calls for purgation:

[1] " Quemadmodum Israelitae nomen τῶν ἁγίων sibi vindicarunt ut quos Deus sibi a ceteris populis segregaverit vitam ipsi acceptam acturos ipsiusque favore ac tutamine gavisuros, ita hoc praedicatum saepissime in N.T. transfertur ad Christianos quos Deus ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου selegerit ut Spiritu Sancto imbuti pietate et probitate salutis in regno Dei participes redderentur " (Wilk-Grimm, *Lexicon*, s.v.).

"Whom He forcordains them He also calls; whom He calls them He justifies; whom He justifies He also glorifies."[1] So in 1 Peter ii. 9 Christians are a "holy nation." The phrase ἐκκλησία ἁγία occurs in the inscription of the letter of Ignatius to the Trallians, and the phrase τῆς ἁγίας καὶ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας in that of the Martyr Polycarp, and τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας in Hermas, *Vis.* i. 1. 6.

In all these passages the meaning of the adjective *holy* as applied to the Church is that of Divine institution, of being a thing which was separated off by its origin and nature from any humanly founded society. The Church is holy for the same reason the Spirit is holy, viz. that it belongs to the Divine order, and not that of this perishing world here below. But in so far as the Church takes shape and substance in this world it ranges itself alongside other objects which occupy space and time and are subject to the planetary powers, and so runs the risk of being confounded with them. A Church which fights for its own hand, accepts property, enjoys prestige and wields power, which enters into controversy and uses the weapons of earthly warfare, may be rightfully fulfilling its mission, but can hardly complain if it is charged with being of the earth earthy. When Richard Lionheart captured the Bishop of Beauvais in battle, and when he was called on by the Pope to release his captive without

[1] Rom. viii. 30, where the aorists are gnomic, describing the process, or else point to a definite act in the ideal world. The use of ἁγία in Eph. v. 27 might seem to contradict the use of the word as meaning *consecrated*, until it is observed that it is not the future which the writer has in view but the present ("id valet suo modo iam de hac vita," Bengel). He means: "Christ's love for His Church is such that He gives Himself for its good, consecrates it and purifies it, that He may Himself (and not somebody else) present it to Himself as a consecrated and spotless being here and now. Such should be the love of the husband for his wife."

ransom as being a son of the Church, he sent the Bishop's armour to his Holiness with the caustic remark, "Know now whether this be thy son's coat or no, which aptly raised the question of the liberty of the Church to identify herself with the world. Hence the necessity of frequent and public promulgation of the fact that the Church that Christian members believe in is not the empirical Church, but the ideal Church, the Jerusalem which is above, which is the mother of them all.[1]

This truth has been emphasised often enough. The ideal Church already existent is called "Mount Sion," the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,[2] built on the "hill of the Lord" of Ps. xxiv. 3, the Mount of Contemplation to which Moses, Lot, Aaron, Abraham, Elijah, ascended, whence Jesus spoke His sermon, on which He was transfigured, and from which He ascended.[3] So

[1] Gal. iv. 26. It is forgetfulness of this which made possible the lines :

"In days of old
Cross of wood and bishop of gold ;
But now they have altered that law so good
To cross of gold and bishop of wood."

[2] Heb. xii. 22.

[3] Origen in Joann., tom. ii. 6, gives a sentence from the Gospel of the Hebrews : "Just now my Mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs, and carried me off to the great mountain, Tabor." Cf. Resch, *Agrapha*, pp. 238-240 ; Bel and the Dragon, v. 36 ; in the *Acts of John* it is on the Mount where John is shown the spiritual crucifixion ; in the Gospel of Eve, according to Epiphanius, it was on a lofty mountain that the seer was standing when he saw a Great Man and another maimed man (*Haer.* xxvi. 3 ; Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 266) ; Hermas was carried by the angel to Arcadia to a certain small round mountain, and was placed on its summit (*Sim.* ix. 1. 4) ; in the *Corpus Hermeticum*, xiii. (xiv.), in the "Secret Sermon on the Mountain," Tat speaks of becoming a Suppliant of Hermas, and of being led by him "upon the pass of the mountain" (ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ ὄρους μεταβάσεως), *i.e.* from intellectual knowledge to the summit of intuitive ; so Jesus led His disciples to the Mount of Olives and there left them (Acts i. 12), and appeared to them on the mountain He had appointed (Matt. xxviii. 16). A hill, or mountain, is the mystic name for the state of consciousness known as contemplation (Rev. xxi. 10).

a promise was made to the Church in Philadelphia that the victor should receive a triple name, the name of God, of the City of God, " the new Jerusalem which is (ever) descending out of heaven from God," and the new name—all of which form one name.[1] Here Jerusalem is transcendental in its essence but immanent in its activities, for it is continuously descending to earth. Just as the Logos becomes man so does the Ecclesia become " flesh." The book of 4 Esdras, in its fourth Vision, sets the heavenly Jerusalem over against the earthly, and the Apocalypse of Baruch [2] says that the destroyed Jerusalem was not the true Jerusalem, for this was kept by God from the beginning of the world, and was seen by Moses on Mount Sinai.[3] " Dost thou remember," says the Lord, " what that city is of which I said, ' I have graven thee upon the palm of my hands ' ? " " No earthly city this, but a heavenly mystic one, prepared before the world was made, shown to Adam before he fell in Paradise, but withdrawn, as Eden itself, after he had sinned. Abraham too beheld it when he kept watch between his victims slain; and to Moses it was revealed on Mount Sinai, when he received the communication touching the Tabernacle and its

[1] R. Samuel says that R. Jochanan said that three are called by the name of God, the righteous, the Messiah, and Jerusalem. " It is often incorrectly said that the victor receives three names—of God, of the Church, and of Christ; but the real meaning is that a name is written on him which has all three characters, and is at once the name of God, the name of the Church, and the new name of Christ " (Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches*, 1904, p. 412). Better, however, to say that the new name, like the " new song," belongs to the new man, and that it marks him as new-born into the family of God, the pre-existent Church.

[2] Chap. iv.

[3] Cf. the Zohar (*Genes*, F. 69): " Deus innovabit mundum suum et aedificabit Hierosolyma, ut ipsam descendere faciat in medium sui de coelo ita ut numquam destruatur."

appurtenances. Since then it has been kept in the secret place of God till the time of its disclosure should arrive." [1]

That the "holiness" of the Church was found in its Divine appointment, and not only in its moral character, is further evidenced by the following passage from Hermas: "Behold, the God of the Powers, who by his invisible power and might and great understanding created the world, and by his glorious counsel threw round his creation the mantle of beauty, and by his strong word established the heaven and founded the earth on the waters, and by his own wisdom and foreknowledge created his holy Church, which also he blessed, lo, he removes the heavens and the mountains and the hills and the seas, and all things become level for his elect." [2]

In Justin Martyr [3] a word of Jesus is cited: *καθὼς εἴρηκεν ἐν οὐρανῷ τὴν κατοίκησιν ἡμῶν ὑπάρχειν.* Echoes of this *agraphon* are to be found in Phil. iii. 20: "Our citizenship is in heaven" (*πολίτευμα* for *κατοίκησις*); also in 2 Cor. v. 1, "We have a building from God, an aeonian house in the heavens" (*οἰκοδομὴν οἰκίαν αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*); and in Heb. xiii. 14, "We have not here an abiding city" (*μένουσαν πόλιν ἀλλὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν*); and John xiv. 2, "In my Father's house are many mansions." [4]

This doctrine of the holiness of the ideal Church

[1] W. J. Deane, *Pseudepigrapha*, 1891, p. 161; cf. 2 Esdras iii. 6, vii. 26, xiii. 36; Exod. xxv. 40.

[2] *Vis.* i. 3. 4; cf. also iii. 3. 3.

[3] *De resurr.* 9. in Preuschen, *Antileg.*, 1905, p. 51.

[4] With the above should be compared Luke xvi. 9, Eph. ii. 12, Phil. i. 27, and *Ep. ad Diognetum*, v. 9: Christians "spend their time on earth, but their citizenship is in heaven"; Resch, *Agrapha*, 1906, p. 103.

existent in the heavens held the members of the Church on earth so long as they retained the consciousness of having been born again into the heavenly order by an inner act of God. While this formed the basis of their religion it was just the holy Church unseen which occupied their thoughts and secured their devotion, and the Church, or community of Christians on earth, was but a projection into the world of space and time of the unseen and real Church. "Holy Spirit and holy Church were inseparably connected. The Church, or, in other words, the community of all believers, attains her unity through the Holy Spirit. This unity manifested itself in brotherly love, and in the common relation to a common ideal and a common hope. The assembly of all Christians is realised in the Kingdom of God, viz. in heaven; on earth Christians and the Church are dispersed and in a foreign land. Hence, properly speaking, the Church herself is a heavenly community inseparable from the heavenly Christ. Christians believe that they belong to a real superterrestrial commonwealth, which from its very nature cannot be realised on earth." [1] The primitive idea of the Church, then, was sufficiently marked by its oldest and most constant predicate, *holy*, which marked it out as being on earth a stranger and a pilgrim, but being in reality a denizen of the intelligible sphere, appearing indeed in time, but dwelling in the aeonian world. "All the lofty designations which Paul, the so-called Apostolic Fathers, and Justin gathered from the O.T. and applied to the Church relate to the holy community which originates in heaven and returns thither." [2]

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, ii. 73; cf. *Ep. ad Diognetum*, v. 5.
[2] Harnack, *l.c.* ii. 74.

When, however, the Church began to draw increasing members into its ranks the holiness of the ideal Church gradually retired into the background, and was replaced by a holiness which was found in the possession of a divinely-given formula of faith and a divinely-appointed organisation. The centre of gravity was shifted from within to without; a law or *regula fidei* was imposed in place of the truth inwardly embraced; the brotherhood disappeared in the political commonwealth; quality gave way, as so often happens, to quantity. The Church came to be no longer the holy Church of Jesus Christ, but two parties, one offering and one accepting salvation. Obedience to the Church, *i.e.* its authorities, became a prime Christian virtue. "The Church is a holy institution in virtue of the gifts with which she is endowed," not because her abiding-place is in heaven, in the sanctuary of God. This transformation may be said to have been effected for all practical purposes by the beginning of the fourth century, and it is registered in the Edict of Milan of A.D. 313.

Εἰς καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν

The previous sections on the epithets *one* and *holy* have created a presumption that the third epithet of *catholic* will prove to be in its present acceptation the degraded form of an earlier ideal concept. Just as the unity flashed out by *one* was and is found in the ideal Church alone, and just as *holy* points with equal clearness to the Divine side of the Church, so we may expect that *catholic* will prove to have descended from the ideal world into the empirical. But it is not enough to rest on a

presumption; we must examine also the examples of its actual use. There is no question about the later use; our business is to discover whether this later use is on a level with the earlier, or is a lower form of it.

The earliest ecclesiastical use of the term καθολικός is in Ignatius:[1] "Be followers, all of you, of the bishop, as Jesus Christ of the Father, and of the presbytery as of the apostles; give heed to the deacons as to the command of God. Apart from the bishop let no one do anything of the things which pertain to the Church. Let that eucharist be regarded as valid which is under the bishop, or which he commands. Wherever the bishop is there let the commonalty be, just as where Christ Jesus is there is the catholic church." Elsewhere[2] Ignatius asserts explicitly that it was the Spirit who caused him to "shout aloud in their midst with a loud voice, the voice of God, saying: 'Do nothing without the bishop; keep your flesh as the temple of God; love unity, flee divisions; be imitators of Jesus Christ as also He was of His Father.'" And[3] he promises to write, "especially if the Lord reveal anything," and goes on to exhort his readers as he had done those of Smyrna to "obey the bishop and the presbytery with undistracted mind, eating one bread, the medicine of immortality, an antidote against death, but the food of life in Jesus Christ for ever."

From these passages it is clear that: (1) Ignatius based his doctrine about the Church on direct revelation from the Spirit, probably in an ecstasy,

[1] *Ad Smyrn.* viii. 2. [2] *Ad Phil.* vii.
[3] *Ad Eph.* xx. 1.

which then he gave forth afterwards as a prophet; (2) the Church he would fain see established was an image of the Church in the heavens; there the Father was the source of all authority and unity; Jesus Christ was obedient to the Father, and indissolubly connected with Him were the Apostles and the angels. On earth, therefore, the bishop who represented the Father must have unquestioned obedience; the Church on earth must be as inseparably united with the bishop as the Church in heaven with the Father, and the presbytery and the deacons must be revered because of their heavenly originals. The parallel between the ideal and the empirical Church is drawn point by point, and includes, therefore, the use of the term *catholic*. It, too, has its origin and home in heaven, and in so far as it has descended to earth it is as a reflection of the heavenly reality.

What then does Ignatius mean by *catholic* as descriptive of a heavenly quality? Referring to the passage to the Smyrnaeans just quoted, Harnack says: "In this passage these words do not yet express a new conception of the Church, which represents her as an empirical commonwealth. Only the individual earthly communities exist empirically, and the universal, *i.e.* the whole Church, occupies the same position towards these as the bishops of the individual communities do towards the Lord."[1] But Ignatius knew nothing of a "universal" Church as the sum of local communities held together externally; hence he uses the word *catholic*, or *universal*, in its logical sense as denoting the universal against the particular, the principle against specific embodiments of it, or the ideal

[1] *History of Dogma*, ii. 74.

against the actual.[1] It is therefore a mistake to interpret the term catholic whenever it occurs in the first three centuries as denoting a large geographical extension as against a smaller. It possesses at least another, and an earlier meaning, not far removed from that of an Idea of Plato.

It is not easy, however, to find our way back through the forest of ecclesiastical history to this primitive fastness, so persistently and dogmatically and vociferously has the term *catholic* been claimed for a different and a lower setting of fact. "Catholic," it has been often urged, denotes the Church as meant for all peoples and not the Jewish in special, a definition, it might have been thought, which at once invited some consideration of what it was which constituted the universality of the Church. Or it was used in disparagement of the heretical bodies, by way of assigning to them a partial or local importance over against the "Great Church," or the community of Churches, which claimed to stand on the ancient paths, and this without analysing sufficiently the grounds on which catholicity fell to the army with the bigger battalions. Or it came to be synonymous with primitive, with "quod semper," as denoting that which a selected early period held and professed authoritatively, though the reasons which lay behind the selection of the age of the four great Councils, or of the seven, or of the first six centuries, were never clearly put into the light. Or the term Catholic has been annexed by the "Holy, Roman Church" to express

[1] So *γενικός* is opposed to *εἰδικός*, as general to special; *καθολικῷ λογῷ* (Arist. *Plant.* ii. 6. 1) is to speak generally; so *τὸ καθόλου* is a universal as opposed to *τὸ κατὰ μέρος*, a particular; the universal in metaphysics, however, so far as it is not a mere logical abstraction, is the ideal which is constantly seeking expression in actuality.

her claim to universal dominion, and the widespread acceptance of that annexation is proof of the thoroughness with which the claim has been maintained. Lastly, the word "Catholic" has been degraded to a loose and shadowy usage which equates it with dilettantism in taste and an undiscriminating liberalism in speculation.

What, however, all these lower uses of the term prove is not that they are not correct in their various special meanings, but that they register the level of religion in the body or writer by whom they are used. With the Greek religion is conservatism, with the Roman dominion, with the Anglican antiquity, with the Puritan bodies liberalism. And all, through their very variations, confess that the one thing of which they are severally variants must be sought elsewhere.

We have already shown cause for holding that the Church on earth is the reflection of the Church pre-existent in the heavens; and we have also shown that the use of the term *Catholic* by Ignatius presupposes the same truth. So far, therefore, is Ignatius from countenancing the later appeal to it in favour of ecclesiasticism that he rather makes against it, as in his mouth its base is prophetic and not institutional. But Ignatius is not our sole witness. St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catechetical Lectures* certainly identifies the Church with the empirical Church, but yet the explanations he gives of the epithet *Catholic* carry him far away from the visible Church to the ideal. For the Church is adorned with all virtues, it teaches all doctrines to all men, cures all diseases of soul or body, and possesses all gifts and graces.[1] Apollinaris, Bishop

[1] *Cat.* xviii. 22-27.

of Hierapolis at the time of Marcus Aurelius,[1] wrote to Avircius Marcellus a letter against the Montanists in which he complained that they prophesied in a way different from the custom which was in accordance with the tradition and teaching of the Church received from above.[2] But if the Church received its teaching from above, then that teaching takes its origin from the Holy Spirit, for the Spirit and the Church belong to the same Divine supernatural order.[3]

The most striking illustration of the use of the word *Catholic* to express the necessary and universal truth whose home is the ideal or intelligible world is found in the famous passage in which Irenaeus

[1] See Harnack, *Die altchrist. Lit.* i. 243 f.

[2] Παρὰ τὸ κατὰ παράδοσιν καὶ κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἄνωθεν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔθος. Διαδοχὴν is, I think, an error for διδαχὴν. The phrase in Clem. Al. (*Strom.* iv. 2. 2), τοῦ κανόνος, τῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ διαδοχὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐρανίου ἐκκλησίας, is not parallel, and ἄνωθεν is not "from of old," as Canon Selwyn renders it (*The Christian Prophets*, 1900, p. 17), but as in John iii. 3, "from above," *i.e.* ἐξ οὐρανοῦ or ἐκ Θεοῦ. "Das spätere Schlagwort der Mysterien 'Renatus in aeternum' (so hiess in Rom, wer der grossen Mutter und dem Attis Taurobolium und Kriobolium dargebracht hatte) liegt immer noch näher als A.T. Analogien" (H. J. Holtzmann in *Hand-Komment.* iv. 63).

[3] Cf. Tertullian: "Ipsa ecclesia proprie et principaliter ipse est spiritus . . . atque ita exinde etiam numerus omnis qui in hanc fidem conspiraverint ecclesia *ab auctore et consecratore censetur*. Et ideo ecclesia quidem delicta donabit, sed ecclesia spiritus per spiritalem hominem non ecclesia numerus episcoporum" (*De pudic.* 21). Clement Al. says the same: "As the will of God is a work, and this is called *cosmos*, so His counsel is the salvation of men, and this has been called *ecclesia*" (*Paed.* i. 6. 27). So "the earthly Church is an image of the heavenly Church, τῆς οὐρανίου ἐκκλησίας (Origen, *De princip.* iv. 2. 2, also speaks of ἡ οὐράνιος ἐκκλησία), therefore we pray 'thy will be done on earth as in heaven'" (*Strom.* iv. 26. 172). I do not understand how Harnack sees (*Strom.* vii. 17. 107) a clear formulation of the empirical Church in the words: "I suppose it has become plain that the true Church which is really from of old (τῷ ὄντι ἀρχαίαν) is one, into which the righteous are gathered according to (God's) purpose; for God is one and the Lord is one . . . and the one Church, then, has attained her lot by the very nature of unity." For this is proper to the Church above, but it is the division into heresies which is the lot of the Church below (ἣν εἰς πολλὰς κατατέμνειν βιάζονται αἱρέσεις). Cf. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, ii. 81.

insists that he and his gnostic opponents agree on one point, at all events, viz. the number four as determining the only possible number of the Gospels. His ground is that "God has made all things in due proportion and adaptation," *i.e.* after the pattern of heavenly things. Hence the Cherubim were four-faced in order that they might fitly represent the fourfold aspects of the eternal Word, heaven has "four Catholic spirits,"[1] the Church has four Gospels, and God gave four τέσσαραι καθολικαὶ διάθηκαι, viz. to Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus Christ. Because then there is a fourfold pattern in the heavens, the Gospels, he concludes, must be neither more nor less than four.[2] Catholic then means first what is Real, hence necessary, and then, on the phenomenal plane, universal.

The older and the higher meaning of the Church still shines out in Clement Al. He says that it is not the Church which is Mother, but it is the Divine gnosis and wisdom,[3] although in *Paed.* i. 6. 42 he says that "the universal Father (ὁ τῶν ὅλων Πατήρ) is one, and one the universal Word; and the Holy Spirit is one and the same everywhere, and one is the only virgin-mother. I love to call her the Church." Here the "catholicity" of the Church is equated with the catholicity of the Father and of the Word. Similarly, in *Paed.* i. 5. 21, he says that "the mother draws the children to herself, and we seek our mother, the Church." He then goes on to interpret the sporting of Isaac and Rebekah told of in Gen. xxvi. 8 as typifying our rejoicing (Isaac = laughter) over our salvation with the Church to whom the stable name of endurance is given

[1] Τέσσαρα καθολικὰ πνεύματα, which can hardly be the four winds.
[2] *Adv. Haer.* iii. 11. 8. [3] *Strom.* vi. 16. 146.

(Rebekah, however, is taken ordinarily to mean a cord), "for this cause surely, because she alone remains to all generations, rejoicing ever, subsisting as she does by the endurance of us believers, who are the members of Christ." But what remains to all generations belongs to the eternal order, not to the world of Becoming; in other words, Clement regards the catholicity of the Church as being ideal, and as being only partially and gradually embodied in the Church visible on earth.

From the time of Origen onwards the conception of the Church as our heavenly Mother, though never wholly lost, receded more and more into the background. It has a leading place in the teaching of St. Augustine, and especially when piety rather than polemic was his immediate object. "That we believe 'in remission of sins through the Holy Church,' that 'he cannot have God for his Father who has not the Church for his Mother,' that salvation is in the Church alone, 'extra ecclesiam nulla salus,' were ideas in full currency very long before Augustine's time, and he simply entered upon them as part of the traditional heritage of Catholic belief." [1] But what is certain is that the heritage entered on by Augustine was the *damnosa haereditas* of the compromise made between the Church and the World, which had thrown the shadow of eclipse over the heavenly side of ecclesiastical institutions, and had succeeded in identifying in most minds the empirical, existing Church with the ideal, pre-existing Church, with the result that there was transferred to the former the attributes of the latter,

[1] Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, p. 186; Dr. Robertson, however, earlier (p. 183) does justice to the element of "abstract idealism" in Augustine's utterances.

to the confusion of men's minds and the dechristianising of their doings. Thus the maxim, " extra ecclesiam nulla salus," which is an axiom when applied to the Church in heaven, became an instrument of tyranny when applied to the Church on earth. The Divine truth was changed into a human falsehood, and from the falsehood sprang the auto-da-fé. Similarly the catholicity which is the prerogative of the heavenly Mother in virtue of the love which makes her draw to her heart all the sons of men, when transferred to the empirical Church is prostituted into a thirst for dominion which has been the fertile mother of division, wars, greed, and cruelty.[1]

Εἰς ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν

The adjective " apostolic " as applied to the Church is at once the latest of the four " Notes," and the most useful to the ecclesiastic. In its current usage it bears every mark of having been coined for the defeat of heretics. For the heretic equally with the orthodox appealed to the Scriptures and claimed to possess the Spirit. Hence it was necessary to set up another authority which was beyond the reach of attack by the heretic. This was found in the Catholic Church as founded by the Apostles, having an apostolic rule of faith, a collection of apostolic writings, and an apostolic organisation.

The creation of these three " apostolic " canons is the peculiar glory of the Church of Rome, and

[1] " Have you ever, when riding near sunset or soon after sunrise, noticed the shadow of yourself and your horse on the road before you ? Such a ridiculous shadow is the visible Church of the invisible " (Coventry Patmore, *The Rod, the Root, and the Flower*, p. 187).

they form the triple weapon with which, as the legitimate heir of the imperial spirit of the Roman Empire, she smote down emergent heresies and schisms. The needs of other Churches and the dangers of the time brought help to the Roman bishops, and brought it so effectually that in the end the "apostolic Church" not only stamped out heresy but subjugated also its sister-churches as well.[1] Where it was insufficient to appeal to a common canon of writings, or a common rule of faith, recourse was had to the authority of those Churches which could claim an apostle as their founder, and could state the line of bishops who derived from him. As the Roman Church was the only Church in the West which possessed this distinction, and since it, moreover, was the Church of the city with the greatest prestige and influence, its bishop naturally came to be the occupier of the "Apostolic See," *par excellence*, and the canon he approved, the *regula fidei* he used, and the cult he presided over assumed, at any rate for the Western Churches, a preponderant authority.

This is what Irenaeus is referring to in the famous passage: "Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est [*ἀνάγκη* not *δεῖ*] omnem convenire [resort to = perhaps *πανταχόθεν συντρέχειν*; in iii. 11. 8 and i. 16. 2 *πανταχόθεν* is rendered *undique*; in iii. 18. 3 *πανταχοῦ* is rendered *ubique*] ecclesiam (hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles) in qua semper, ab his qui sunt undique [not *ubique*] conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio." Rome, he says, is a place where

[1] Tertullian pithily puts the case for apostolicity: "Constat omnem doctrinam quae cum ecclesiis apostolicis matricibus et originalibus fidei conspiret veritati deputandam, id sine dubio tenentem quod ecclesiae ab apostolis, apostoli a Christo, Christus a deo accepit" (*De praescr.* ch. xxi.).

Christians from all sides are compelled to resort for business, and hence it is there where we can most easily determine what is of apostolic origin by the testimony of the many witnesses who may be there interrogated. The reason which made Irenaeus exalt Rome was the same which moved Cyprian to say, "Quoniam pro magnitudine sua debeat Carthaginem Roma praecedere" (*Ep.* 52. 2). The claim to apostolic authority took its rise from the exigencies of ecclesiastical or party struggles, and would never have attained the vigour it displayed for centuries had its practical value been less.[1]

When, however, we enquire into the history of those apostles to whom the later Church gave such decisive authority we are faced with difficulties, some of which are refractory to all research. In the first place two sets of Apostles, or two conceptions of the apostolic office, meet us. In the Gospels the word "apostles" occurs eight times only;[2] the first four occur in the account of the sending of the twelve disciples out as missionaries; the fifth is perhaps a reminiscence of an O.T. passage;[3] and the last three only use the term *apostles* as a technical term for the immediate circle of disciples. On the other hand, *the twelve* is the constant name for that circle, and is used in all four Gospels (in all thirty times), in Acts vi. 2, 1 Cor. xv. 5, Rev. xxi. 14, and does not occur elsewhere in N.T.

[1] Cf. Harnack's Lecture, 1893, on *Das Zeugniss des Irenaeus über das Ansehen der römischen Kirche*, in which he takes a different view. He argues that *convenire* may as well represent συμβαίνειν εἰς as συντρέχειν, and that the credal agreement so affirmed is a necessity to every Church because of Rome's unique position, being a Church "maxima, antiquissima, ab omnibus cognita, a Paulo et Petro fundata." It is, however, interesting to note that he cites Iren. iii. 11. 8, where *principales* is rendered καθολικά.

[2] Matt. x. 2, Mark vi. 30, Luke vi. 13, ix. 10, xi. 49, xvii. 5, xxii. 14, xxiv. 10.

[3] Perhaps from 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16. Cf. xxiv. 19.

But the term apostle is used in a wider sense to denote anybody who was sent out as a missionary. Thus Paul calls himself an apostle of Christ Jesus ; [1] he calls Barnabas [2] and Silvanus,[3] and Andronicus and Junias apostles, and alludes in indignant tones to " false apostles " [4] and in irony to " superlative apostles." [5] Barnabas, too, is called an " apostle " in Acts xiv. 4, 14, and in Rev. ii. 2 is an allusion to some who called themselves apostles and were not.

It is not unimportant to note that the Jewish Church possessed an apostolic organisation before the institution of the Christian Church, and that Saul was one of its representatives. It was the duty of these Jewish apostles to collect the temple-tribute from the Jews of the Dispersion ; to bear encyclical letters from Jerusalem to the local synagogues ; to execute disciplinary measures, and to form a council for the Patriarch.[6] These Jewish apostles, according to Justin and Origen, undertook the task of disseminating the adverse judgment of the Jewish authorities on the Christians.

Further, Eph. ii. 20, speaks of the community being builded " on the foundation of the apostles and prophets," where the genitive is not one of possession, nor of the author, nor objective, but of apposition. The Gentile believers were stones in the same building as the Jewish *ἅγιοι*, and they were both alike built into the building of which apostles

[1] Rom. i. 1, 1 Cor. i. 1, 2 Cor. i. 1, Gal. i. 1, etc., Rom. xi. 13, 1 Cor. iv. 9, ix. 1, etc.

[2] 1 Cor. ix. 4, 6. [3] 1 Thess. i. 1. [4] 2 Cor. xi. 13.

[5] *Οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι*, 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11.

[6] See Justin, *Dial.* 17. 108 ; Euseb. in Isa. xviii. 1 ; Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 4 ; and Harnack's discussion in *Mission und Ausbreitung*, 1902, pp. 230-239.

and prophets were themselves the foundation. We cannot take *apostles* here in any sense but that of messengers of God in general, who went from Church to Church "edifying" each, just as prophets were those Christians who received revelations directly from the Spirit and then gave them forth to any Church they might visit.

What the N.T. suggests, then, is that prophets in the wider sense were indefinitely many, but that in the narrower sense the Christian Church at Jerusalem, as the mother of all others, was regarded as the centre of all, and possessed a council which went by the name of "the Twelve." This might have been the number and designation of the apostolic body at the disposal of the Jewish Patriarch, and in that case the Christian Twelve would be modelled on the Jewish Twelve; and this might also have determined the choice of "the Twelve" by Jesus Christ.

In any case, it is clear that the number was determined by the number of the twelve tribes of Israel.[1] The number, too, is apparently of more importance than any precise body making it up, for in the Blessings of Moses in Deut. xxxiii. Simeon is omitted, and in Rev. vii., Dan; in Num. ii. Levi is not reckoned, nor in Ezek. xlviii. 1-29, but in vv. 31-34 he is included.

The ambiguity in the New Testament use of the term "apostle" is caused by the same historical conflict between the ideal and the actual in the early Church which has met us already several times. The earliest Church was mystical, unorganised, and formless. Later it borrowed the forms it felt to be

[1] See Matt. xix. 28, Luke xxii. 30, Acts vii. 8, xxvi. 7, Jas. i. 1, Rev. vii. 5 f., xii. 1, xxi. 12 f., xxii. 2.

necessary to it from the world around it. From being mystic predominantly it became Catholic predominantly. And in the former condition it was apostolic in a sense which was lost, or if not lost, made subordinate in the latter. In the earlier condition *apostolic* emphasised the inner and Divine authority with which the messenger was invested. In the later it distinguished the officer of a historical and orthodox Church from the upstart representative of a Church which could not trace its ancestry to the beginning, and was at the same time heretical. It is the earlier sense which is the permanent and more important sense. The latter filled a want for a time, and has long ceased to have any religious value.

But why should the Church in the heavens be called *apostolic*? Surely, it might be urged, here, if anywhere, we strike on a solid rock of historic fact which is fatal to all mystical alchemy. We think not. In Luke xi. 49,[1] we read: "Therefore also said the Wisdom of God, I will send unto them prophets and apostles."[2] This saying of the Wisdom of God is certainly not a direct quotation from the Old Testament, and it is a mere conjecture to refer it to some unknown writing of Old Testament times, or to an earlier saying from Jesus Himself. Whatever the original, however, the meaning is clear enough. It states the general law which the stubbornness of the Jews exemplified. God is ever sending His messengers to us, and we as constantly ill-treat them. If we kill them that

[1] Cf. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16, and xxiv. 19.

[2] In the parallel passage, Matt. xxiii. 34, it is "prophets, wise men, and scribes," where apostles are elaborated, after the manner of the first Gospel, into two classes.

is only possible when they come in the flesh, but it belongs to the universality of the saying that we include also those apostles and prophets of God who are not in the flesh. We thus get as our result: God never leaves Himself without witness, for He is ceaselessly engaged in sending us messengers, unseen or seen, who by virtue of the nature of their office are called *prophets*, and by virtue of the source of their authority are called *apostles*. Every prophet is first an apostle.

We rise, therefore, from the particular to the universal, as we ought to do. The prophets and apostles whom the Jews slew are representative of a great army out of all peoples, nations, and tongues, who were God's messengers, from Socrates dying from his hemlock to Christ on the rood. Their importance was not so much in that they were killed as in that they came from God. And, therefore, they represent also the angels, who cannot indeed be killed, but can meet with opposition out of the same obstinacy which, where men are concerned, leads to murder.

This brings us to the recognition of a "note" of the Church which is both of importance and is also of one piece with the view of the Church we have already taken on other grounds. The Church we believe in is the Church of the angels and of the spirits of just men made perfect who are ἰσάγγελοι, equal to the angels,[1] and hence are ministering spirits sent out[2] for service. In short, the Church of the Creed is, among other things, a Church which is not only founded on apostles, but is also maintained continually by the ministry of "apostles," being sent out, whether in the flesh or not.

[1] Luke xx. 36. [2] Ἀποστελλόμενα.

This conclusion may be and should be carried one step further. The instinct of the Church Catholic here on earth has always driven it to be a missionary Church, an apostolic Church, nor could it well be otherwise. For in proportion as any concrete society on earth is a reflection in ultimates of the society which is eternal in the heavens it is, like God's love, expansive. It must carry to others the chance of sharing what it has itself received. This, however, is not to say that the living Light of Christianity which is to be passed on, as the light of a torch is passed on from one to another, is to be confined to a set of lamps manufactured after any one pattern. The forms of the Church militant cannot without grievous loss be transported to lands accustomed to other forms as of equal worth with their content. And the "apostle" of the Church is given the light of Life to kindle through the sacrament of his own transmuted personality, and it is at least doubtful whether any other sacrament, whether of word or act, can be put on the same level as that. This light of Life for us has been put into vessels fashioned by the Paganism of Western Asia and the Mediterranean lands, and these have served and serve still our needs. But why should not China or India do now what Hellenism did for Christianity nineteen centuries ago — furnish native forms of Creed, cult, and discipline? Is the Lord's arm shortened that it cannot save, or His Spirit withdrawn? If He be still the unseen Guide into all the truth may He not be trusted to lead His apostolic Church by the Way it should go?

CHAPTER XXII

THE NINTH ARTICLE—PART III

The Communion of Saints

Ἁγίων κοινωνίαν

THE origin and primary meaning of this Article are obscure. None of the Creeds before A.D. 400 possess it; it is not clear what "communion" stands for—whether for an act or a concrete object; whether the word rendered "saints" refers to things or persons, or if to persons whether it relates to those in the flesh, or those out of it, or both. Nor is there any certainty whether the good thing described in the Article is a present possession or a future gift. That is to say, the Article may mean one or all of the following:

(*a*) An inner participation by all Christians of the one life which informs the Church;

(*b*) A continued communion of spiritual life with the faithful departed;

(*c*) A hope for such communion when the Christian himself passes over to Paradise;

(*d*) A belief that ultimately all blessings will be given to the Christian to the full;

(*e*) A participation in the Sacraments and other goods of the Church Catholic;

(*f*) An affirmation that the undivided Catholic Church *is* a community of saints.

The last is that favoured by the Donatists in early times, and by Luther later.[1] The rest fall under the two heads of (*a*) communion *with* or in the saints, and (*b*) communion *in* holy, *i.e.* sacred things. And under (*a*) come (1) a reference to the saints in the flesh, and (2) to the saints departed. We propose to discuss this Article under each of these three heads.

I. *Communion with Saints on Earth*

The term κοινωνία, which is almost certainly the original Greek term here translated *communion*, occurs twice only in the LXX., viz. in Lev. vi. 2, where it means bargain, a "mutuum commercium data manu initum"; and in Wisd. viii. 18, where it is said of divine Wisdom that "there is glory in the communion of her words." The cognate verb κοινωνέω, however, occurs twelve times, and in these passages the dominant meaning is that of fellowship, common membership in a society, similarity of living. The noun occurs twenty times in the N.T., and the verb eight times, and the dominant meaning in these is that of participation in a common good. The participation, however, is not made *explicitly* to rest on a prior membership in the same society.

The Creed, according to the Church of Alexandria of the fourth century, is constructed out of various authorities in Denzinger,[2] and the latter part of it

[1] "Ubi est fides sancta ibi est et sancta communio," in App. Augustine, *Sermon* 241, vol. v. 395 Bened.

[2] *Enchiridion*, p. 7.

runs according to Athanasius: "And we believe in the Holy Ghost, of a substance not different from that of Father and Son, but of one substance with the Father and Son, uncreated, perfect, paraclete; who spake in the Law, and in the Prophets, and in the Gospels; who descended on the Jordan, preached to the Apostles, dwelleth in the Saints. And we believe in one catholic and apostolic Church, in one baptism of repentance and remission of sins, in resurrection from the dead, in aeonian judgment both of souls and bodies, in the Kingdom of heavens and aeonian life."

From this and parallel versions of the Creed one fact is plain, viz. that the doctrine of the Holy Ghost pervades the whole of the concluding section. He is represented not only in His supermundane majesty, but in His relations to the saints on earth. He is the inner *form* of the Church—originally He was identical with the Church; He indwells in each individual member (*οἰκοῦν ἐν ἁγίοις*); His is the transmuting power which works through baptism, raises souls from the abode of them that are dead, is the efficient cause of judgment, admits to the Kingdom and raises to the life of heaven. Hence one principal meaning of the Article, "I believe in the communion of saints," will be belief in the participation by all members of the Church in the life of the Spirit.

It was, however, assumed rather than proved that this fellowship in the Spirit involved membership in a visible body, the Church. Strictly speaking, to have the Spirit and to be a member of a local community were not logically identical, although as a matter of fact the two went together ordinarily. But as time went on, and as the visible Church

struck deeper roots, the tendency grew more and more strong to turn the logical distinction into an actual identity, which led naturally to a denial of the Spirit to all who were not of the visible community. But originally it was not membership in the Church which mediated the Spirit, but possession of the Spirit which constituted membership in the Church. The incestuous man whom St. Paul delivered to Satan [1] had by his very wrongdoing shown that he did not possess the Spirit, and therefore he ceased *ipso facto* to be a member of the Church, and the excommunication ordered by St. Paul was but the formal registering of a spiritual fact which had already happened. The man who ceased to follow the Spirit ceased to have any direct interest in the communion of saints.

The reversal of this natural order was the term of a tendency the first beginnings of which we observe in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch. But in him the tendency was but beginning to feel its way, and in his unsystematic thought there is placed side by side an appeal to the Spirit who spoke through him and an attempt to give to his prophetic utterances through the Spirit the force of ecclesiastical law.[2] So Irenaeus declares that "where the Church is there is also the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is there is the Church and all grace." [3] But the ambiguity in this proposition is removed by the context, from which it is abundantly clear that Irenaeus thought of the gift of the Spirit as being conditioned by membership of the Church. Salvation is through faith, and that is received from the Church, guarded by the believer and kept ever fresh by the Spirit.

[1] 1 Cor. v. 4. [2] *Ad Phil.* vii. [3] iii. 38. 1.

The process thus begun continued in spite of Montanism, Monasticism, and Gnosticism until the necessities of government, the decline of religious fervour, and assimilation of the secular spirit produced the Christian Empire and the Peace of the Church. It is a common practice to represent the outlines of settled episcopal government as having been laid down from the first by Jesus Christ, and so to treat the after history of the visible Church as a perpetual struggle of the Church against the encroachments of the Civil power. Hence the decay and final disappearance of prophecy and the prophetic spirit are accounted for as due to the proper opposition of the authorities to unregulated prophecy.[1] But the reverse is a truer statement. Christianity was from the first a prophetic religion, depending, that is, on the spiritual life with which its devotees were immediately in touch, and as this life was gradually crusted over with forms of cult, creed, and law it ceased to be the guide into the truth, and gave way to the ecclesiastical Rule of Faith. In other words, the article, the *Communion of Saints*, no longer was understood to mean primarily that all the Saints were, as such, joint-partakers of the Spirit of God, but that the fellowship they had was firstly in the visible Church, and then, as mediated through that visible Church, in the Spirit.[2]

[1] This is the line taken by Dr. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, 1912, pp. 70 ff., and by Bishop Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, 1901, pp. 136 ff.

[2] Cf. Irenaeus, *ubi supra*: "For this gift of God (the Spirit) was entrusted to the Church, just as the breath was breathed into the creature formed, in order that all the members receiving it might be quickened." On the other hand, the deeper conception of the Church finds expression in Nicetas of Romatiana: "What is the Church but the assembly of the Saints? All from the very beginning of the World, be they patriarchs

It would, however, be a mistake to regard the changed interpretation put on our Article as an unmixed evil. On the contrary, Prophecy obeyed a law of Nature in setting itself to find for itself fitting forms, and it is no discredit to it either that it spoke less emphatically, or that it borrowed its forms from the world in which it found itself. Within and underneath the growing system of Catholic forms there lay biding its time the Life which is Christianity. It might seem that Councils and Popes, imperial donations, perfected organisation, canon law, and creeds ever becoming more rigid would not so much form a channel as block it up. And yet the Montanist movement, Marcion, Origen, and the Alexandrian school, one side of St. Augustine's activities, the Albigensian and allied enthusiasms, Abbot Joachim, St. Francis of Assisi, the Council of Constance, Lollardy and German mysticism, all show that the force of Life, though encumbered, was by no means inert.

In fact, the history of mediaeval Christianity is the exemplification of a law which the enthusiast finds irksome, viz. that Life must come by its own through struggle with the hostility of the Lord of Form. If those who were perfecting the Form crystallised their creed in the motto "Extra

---

such as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, or Prophets, or Martyrs, or other righteous men, who have been, who are, who shall be, are *one* Church, because they, sanctified by *one* faith and *one* conversation, sealed by *one* Spirit, are *one* body whose head is Christ. I say even more, the angels also and all the heavenly powers and dominions are included in the covenant of this *one* Church" (Caspari, *Anecdota*, p. 356). And also in Augustine: "From the beginning of the human race whoever have believed on Him, and have in any way known Him and lived piously and righteously according to His precepts, wherever and whenever they may have been, through Him were undoubtedly saved" (*Ep.* 102. 12 in Bened. ed. ii. 277).

ecclesiam nulla salus," they only succeeded in making those who held Life more important than Form more conscious of the nature of the gift entrusted to them, and more resolute in its defence. Before we could rise to the conception of the Church as a communion of saints of all churches we had to go to school in a Church which excluded or ignored all others, and was content to find the communion of saints within its own borders alone.[1]

II. *Communion with Saints departed*

"The appearance and the original meaning of the clause 'the communion of saints' is most obscure. An attempt has been made to bring it into connection with the descent into hell. In the one would be meant the heavenly fellowship of the saints, in the other of the Old Testament righteous who were brought out of Hades. But this connection is artificial, and even if it had really occurred, it is late. We must consider the clause on its own merits."[2] The clause was of Western origin, probably of South Gallican, and apparently is not

[1] Professor Briggs (*Fundamental Christian Faith*, 1913, p. 194) holds that we cannot regard the clause as simply epexegetical of "Holy Catholic Church," to which Harnack's objection, viz. that such an equating clause is foreign to the structure of the Creed, and that Faustus is against it (*History of Dogma*, v. 244) seems fatal. Dr. Briggs' words are: "This interpretation (of communion *in* the saints) is the one which has come down as an overwhelming tradition compared with which the other interpretations have little weight. This interpretation is also favoured by the addition of this phrase to the article *holy Catholic Church*; it is an additional predicate of the Church as *a Church in which there is a communion of saints*." From this point of view, then, the article distinguishes between the visible Church, consisting of good and bad, and the invisible Church within the other consisting of the saints. And this is practically the view taken above.

[2] Harnack, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 1904, i. 251.

much older than the time of Faustus of Rhegium.[1] The Church of North Africa in Augustine's time did not read this clause in its creed, and it is not likely, therefore, that "the communion of saints" was in apposition to "holy catholic Church" with an anti-Donatist force, or that Augustine had it in his mind when he used the phrase "communio sacramentorum" or "sacramentorum participatio."[2]

It remains that we follow the testimony of Faustus for the contemporary meaning of the clause. He gives it in his interpretation of the creed. "Let us pass on," he says, "to the 'Communion of Saints.' This sentence confounds those who blasphemously declare that the ashes of the Saints and Friends of God ought not to be held in honour, who do not believe that the glorious memory of the blessed martyrs is to be celebrated with honour shown to their resting-places. These men deal with the Creed dishonestly, and have broken their pledge given to Christ in Baptism, and by this denial of their faith have laid open a place for death in the very bosom of Life."[3]

The Article, then, of the Communion of Saints, though it may have acquired later meanings—just as the phrase apart from the Creed may have earlier (as with Augustine) been used to denote relationship to the empirical Catholic Church—yet, if Faustus is to be believed, was introduced into the Creed as a protest against the dishonour shown by Vigilantius

[1] † *Circa* 490.

[2] "The Church of the living God tolerates in the communion of the sacraments the wicked who are at the end to be separated" (*Sermon* ccxiv. 11, Bened. ed. v. 948); in *De catech. rudibus*, c. viii. he speaks of the educated man who comes for participation in the sacraments after having made the acquaintance of the Christian scriptures (ed. Bened. vi. 268).

[3] Given in Caspari, *Quellen*, iv. 273; cf. his second Homily, *ibid. Anecdota*, p. 338.

to the martyrs. The saints, therefore, are specially the martyrs of Christ, and our Article affirms that they are to be had in honour.

Several lines of tendency converged to emphasise this duty. In the first place, the Church had long enjoyed peace under the Empire when the fifth century ended. The martyrs, therefore, were in the haze of the past which surrounds historic figures. As early as the second century indeed they were held in high honour, and their bodies were treasured when possible as precious relics. St. Polycarp enjoyed an anniversary festival at Smyrna immediately after his death. In fact, the honour of festival days was bestowed on martyrs before it was bestowed on Apostles, and the custom of so honouring them spread from the East to the West so rapidly that "from the beginning of the third century the celebration of the anniversary became a matter of universal observance." [1] Originally these celebrations were purely local, but later as the fame of a martyr spread his cult also found other centres. This diffusion of cults was largely aided by the practice of the translation of relics.

In the second place, the way to the Christian cult of martyrs was paved by the current worship of the dead in the pagan world. The Parentalia were succeeded by the birthdays of Martyrs, and the ceremonies of the one afforded the base for the ceremonies of the other. Monica was wont in Africa to offer pottage and bread and wine at the memorials of the saints.[2] "The numerous legends of the fourth and fifth century are but Christian

[1] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, Eng. trans. 1903, p. 284.
[2] Aug. *Conf.* vi. 2.

variants of stories and doings of ancient piety." [1] "The curses on tombstones by which the grave was secured against violation were often copied with slight alterations from the formulas in use among Pagans." [2]

Dr. Bigg finds another connection. "There are so many coincidences between the Pagan doctrine of the Demons and the Christian doctrine of Angels and demons that we are justified in assuming a close historical connection between the two." [3] All the reverence paid by antiquity to ancestors was transferred in the Christian Church of the fifth century to the martyrs, and quite naturally. For as the family clustered round its ancestor as its guardian and continuator so did the local Church as the Christian family find itself represented, and its genuine spirit displayed at its best by the martyr who now was its intercessor in the unseen world and its protector from unknown foes.

We observe the same borrowing in similar practices or beliefs to those just mentioned. The germ of transubstantiation appears in Clement Al.[4] "Purgatory, prayers for the dead, and many other

[1] B. Schultze, *Griech.-röm. Heident.* ii. 351 ; cf. also for another similar borrowing Hermann Jordan, *Gesch. der altchrist. Liter.*, 1911, p. 83 ff. : "But indeed they (the official protocols) form the literary antecedent for all histories of martyrs, so that also here again an old narrative-form exercises decisive influence on the Christian literature. Hence a group of Christian histories of martyrs appears to be nothing but more or less thorough adaptations of these protocols, as, *e.g.*, the stories of the *Martyrdom of the Scilitani* and *Justin and his Companions*." Jordan, however, expressly guards himself against being supposed to hold that Christianity contributed nothing original. For an example of the use by Christians of a heathen protocol, see Eusebius, *K.G.* ii., where is quoted a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria couched in the form of a protocol.

[2] Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, 2nd ed. 116 *n.*

[3] *Ibid.* p. 308.

[4] *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 82.

things . . . are found in Coptic Gnostic writings, and are then met with again in Catholicism." [1] Even the prevailing system of allegorical interpretation which filtered down from Origen and the Alexandrines through Gregory, Augustine, Hilary, the Victors, and Bernard, and dominated mediaeval exegesis, was derived from the Stoics who used it in order to modernise Homer. It is not improbable that we may yet find that as the later development of the hierarchy into archbishops, metropolitans, patriarchs, and primate followed the civil system, so the early episcopacy and its growth into monarchical episcopacy sprang not from Jewish synagogal discipline, but from the mystery-religions.

In the third place, Paganism gave Catholicism yet another impulse towards the cult of the martyrs by the reverence it paid to heroes. The hero was neither God nor man, but was sprung from both, and was akin therefore to both. So the martyr was man, but no longer of ordinary human stature. He was in some way admitted to a closer communion with God, and was favoured with peculiar powers and graces. He was not indeed to be honoured as God, but, on the other hand, he was not to be classed with sinners. "When the martyrs are commemorated at the altar of God we do not pray for them, for it is wrong to pray for a martyr to whose prayers we ought to commend ourselves." [2] And again: "Whatever religious obsequies are conducted in the places of the Martyrs are ornaments of the Memorials, not sacred rites or sacrifices of the dead, as though they were thought to be gods." [3]

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. 263.
[2] Aug. *Sermon* 159, ed. Bened. v. 765; cf. *De civ. Dei*, viii. c. 26.
[3] *De civ. Dei*, viii. 27.

The filiation of this honour paid to martyrs on the pagan cult of heroes is made clear by Clement of Alexandria [1] when, in quoting the dictum of Heraclitus that "gods and men fear those slain in battle," and of Plato,[2] that "he who dies gloriously in war is of the golden race," he says that the golden race is with the gods of the heaven and the fixed sphere, who in special have the government of the providence which concerns men. He denies, however, that those who rush on death are true martyrs or attain to the golden race.

To the martyrs were soon added the Confessors, those who without being put to death for their faith yet made a good confession with or without torture. "Those who were bold to profess Christ before the magistrates, and for His sake incurred the loss of health, or goods, or honours, were denominated confessors." [3]

An inference of some importance may be drawn from this early cult of martyrs and confessors. It rests obviously on the prior belief in personal persistence through death, in a translation according to merit to another sphere of being, and in the possibility of help being given to those left behind by heroic souls. Death is the pathway to Reality, to Ignatius of Antioch the supreme Pathway, the gate of true discipleship.[4] This earthly life, therefore, is but the vestibule of that on the other side, and "death is the veil which those who live call life." Hence the Christianity of the fifth century

[1] *Strom.* iv. 4. 16. [2] *Repub.* v. 468.

[3] Mosheim, *Eccl. History*, pt. i. ch. v. 10; for an expurgated edition of *Acta Martyrum*, see Ruinart, *Selecta et sincera Martyrum acta*, Amsterdam, 1713.

[4] *Ad Eph.* iii. 1; *ad Trall.* v. 2; *ad Rom.* iv. 2; cf., however, Clem. Al. *Strom.* iv. 4. 16.

which inserted in the Creed the article of the Communion of Saints was largely concerned with the religion of the "other side," and not disposed like the present age to confine itself to the service of "this side." Moreover, it assumed without questioning the popular belief enshrined in the Mystery-religions that man had, or was, soul or spirit which persisted through death. Hence it looked for inspiration and help not merely to the example of the saints departed, but much more, and with growing fervour as time went on, to their actual help administered personally from that "other side." The development of this belief in the "golden race" of the saints no doubt brought with it exaggerations and abuses, and established in the Middle Ages something not easily distinguishable from the Egyptian cult of the dead. And it was doubtless the sense of this one-sidedness and of the practical abuses which attended it which caused the Reformers to set their faces against the Invocation of Saints and Masses for the Dead.

It would no doubt be a nice question to enquire how far with this protest was mingled a leaven of irreligion. If religion is based on belief in the invisible, of which the visible order is the effect, then, other things being equal, belief in a dead saint is more religious than belief in a living sinner, unless indeed the two are at bottom the same thing, which they may very well be. It would be then a blunder of the first magnitude in religion to abandon devotion in some form and degree to the saints, and (to use Stowe's phrase) to "unsaint our Churches." Belief in prayer is quite likely, especially in a scientific age, to go when belief in saints goes. For science holds that all effects have a cause—not merely a

First Cause, for of this science can know nothing—and where the effect is produced through a spiritual activity invoking a spiritual being, science will look to an adequate and proximate cause, if it deigns to look at all, and such a cause can be posited nowhere but in a finite centre of spiritual force. But this is the ancient doctrine of angels and saints, perhaps, too, of devils. And it would seem that try as Protestant thought will it cannot rid us of belief in these invisible beings. From which it is not a hazardous corollary that the belief is inexpugnable, not because men are naturally and hopelessly superstitious, but that saints and angels (and devils) occupy a place in the universe, and somehow succeed in persuading us of their existence. Of this fact the article of the Communion of Saints is one standing reminder, whose force it is almost too late now to escape from.

For consider for a moment. When an attempt is made to form a rational conception of the way in which prayer works it takes one of three forms. Either (1) God is thought of as immanent in the world, in which case prayer is regarded as a stirring into activity, through the spirit of the person who prays, of the life-force with which he is in organic relationship. Or (2) God is thought of as a distant Being to whom a prayer travels through space through the appropriate medium, in much the same way that the ether transmits light-waves. Or else (3) God's state is thought of as Kingly ; thousands at His bidding speed, and post o'er land and ocean without rest, and when prayer is made, it may be thought that its " answer " comes through the mediation of one of these ever-ready agents of the Most High. Probably, each of these three modes

of expressing the truth contains part of it, while the whole truth still remains hidden from us while the body we wear is that of our "humiliation." If so, then the doctrine of the Communion of Saints touches the doctrine of prayer at a vital spot.

III. *Communion in Holy Things*

This Article "does not occur as a member of the Creed anywhere on Greek soil; translated literally into Greek the expression 'communion of saints' would mean 'participation in holy things,' that is, in worship, especially in Holy Communion." [1] This interpretation, though favoured by Zahn,[2] can hardly give the original meaning in the face of the words of Faustus of Rhegium cited above. But, on the other hand, it is not to be dismissed summarily, therefore, as wholly alien to the Article. For the ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις of the Eastern Liturgies would give to ἅγια even in the West a reference to the gifts of the Eucharist. The *Didache*, ch. ix., refers the τὸ ἅγιον of Matt. vii. 6 to the Eucharist, 'which was reserved as a holy thing for those alone who had been baptized into the name of the Lord. The "Nicene" Creed places an article about the one baptism after that about the Church. The Creed of the Church of Jerusalem [3] prefixes one on baptism to another on the Church. Athanasius also connects the two. The very interesting Creed of Aphraates [4] joins belief in the coming to life of the dead with belief in the mystery of Baptism.[5]

[1] Harnack, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 1904, i. p. 251.
[2] *Articles of the Apostles' Creed*, p. 199.
[3] Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, p. 10.
[4] *Hom.* i. 19.
[5] See F. C. Burkitt, *Early Christianity*, 1899, p. 34.

In the face of these testimonies to rule out the interpretation before us as an after-thought of theology would be arbitrary, and especially so, if we remember that the ancient Church held the two sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion in far higher honour than any non-Roman Church in the West does to-day. We cannot, however, do more here than indicate the source and nature of this honour. And first as to Baptism.

Holy Baptism

The origin of Baptism as a Christian Sacrament must be sought in the pure command of Jesus Christ, or must be traced to antecedent Jewish practice, or regarded as a loan from Pagan practice. The first of these three hypotheses is no longer held seriously by anybody, seeing that it is admitted that both Jews and Pagans administered baptism in some sense before the time of Jesus. With regard to the practice of the Jews a dispute has prevailed as to whether the custom of baptizing " proselytes of righteousness " was pre-Christian, and in any case it seems difficult to believe that it was much earlier than the days of Hillel and Shammai. In this case the emergence of baptism in Jewish and in Christian circles was practically contemporaneous, and the origin of both most likely must be sought elsewhere. Moreover, the ceremonial purifications of the Jews after incurring uncleanness have nothing in common with baptism as an initiatory rite, which alone concerns us here.[1]

[1] See Schürer, *Jewish People*, Eng. trans. II. ii. p. 321, where is a full list of authorities, and Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, 4th ed. ii. 745-7.

We are referred, therefore, to the Pagan world which surrounded both Judaism and Christianity for an explanation of the origin of initiatory baptism. And at first sight it might seem tempting to look to Mandaean example, seeing that John Baptist, who is a link between Jew and Christian, and is connected with Jordan and the district beyond it, may very likely have been influenced by the Nazoraei. But these practised a daily baptism, and John's stands in the history as a baptism submitted to once for all as a symbol of entrance on a new life, while from the beginning Christian baptism has been "one." There remains the initiatory baptisms which meet us in Pagan cults.

The most striking of these is the famous Taurobolium (or Criobolium), a rite in which the celebrant —priest or layman, man or woman—"clad in a toga worn *cinctu Gabino*, with golden crown and fillets on his head, takes his place in a trench covered by a platform of planks pierced with fine holes, on which a bull, magnificent with flowers and gold, is slain. The blood rains through the platform on to the priest below, who receives it on his face, and even on his tongue and palate, and after the baptism presents himself before his fellow-worshippers purified and regenerated, and receives their salutations and reverence." [1]

It was in the worship of Rhea-Cybele, the Great Mother of the Gods, that this baptism most commonly took place, though it is found also in the worship of Attis, Adonis, Artemis, Isis, and Athene.[2] It reached Rome from the East in the

[1] *Ency. Brit.* 11th ed. s.v.

[2] Pauly, *Real-Ency.*, 1852, s.v.; Prudentius, *Carmina, Peristeph.* x. 1066 f. describes the ceremony; Firmicus Mat. *De errore*, pag. 28.

age of the Antonines, *i.e.* three centuries after the introduction there of the cult itself of the Mater Magna. According to an inscription (now in the Naples Museum) found at Puteoli (?), the earliest extant evidence we have, a taurobolium was celebrated at Puteoli in A.D. 134 in honour of Venus Coelestis, this Venus being a Syro-Phoenician goddess.

Espérandieu [1] gives eleven taurobolic inscriptions dated in the year 176 and nine of the year 241, seven of which latter name a woman as receiving the taurobolium. Of these twenty, all but one name the deity (in that one the name is missing), and the deity is the Mater Magna throughout. In the inscriptions the taurobolium is usually said to be offered on behalf of the Emperor, as *e.g.* in the following, taken from Espérandieu at random: "Pro salute et incolumitate domus divinae r[es] p[ublica] Lactorat[ium] tauropol[ium] fecit."

According to Franz Cumont, by the end of the second century the taurobolium was to be found in Gaul, Italy, Africa, but not in Greece or Asia Minor. He goes on to suggest that the sacrifice belonged originally to Anahita, the Iranian goddess of fertilising waters, whose cult spread at an unknown date across Chaldaea and Asia Minor to Lydia, and was easily identified with the kindred cult of the Mater Magna, especially as both were goddesses of fertility, and were both worshipped with the sacrifice of a bull. "In fact, about the year 100 of our era, following on the conquest and organisation of the oriental provinces, the Mazdean ideas spread in the Latin world; the history of the

[1] *Inscriptions antiques de Lectoure*, Paris, 1892.

cult of Mithras proves this. Like this, the cult of Anahita, before being imported into Italy, mingled in Asia Minor with the cults indigenous there for long centuries." [1]

Although there is no reason for supposing that the taurobolium was an original feature of the cult of Mithra, yet his religion and that of the Mater Magna "lived in intimate communion. . . . Men alone could participate in the secret ceremonies of the Persian liturgy, at least in the Occident. Other mysteries, to which women could be admitted, had therefore to be added in order to complete them, and so the mysteries of Cybele received the wives and daughters of the Mithraists." [2] Hepding, again, maintains that "the course of religious thought both in the taurobolia and in the other initiatory rites of the cults of Cybele and Attis was the same, and that we have no ground for denying the Phrygian origin of the taurobolia." [3] Whatever alien thoughts or alien usages may have attached themselves to the taurobolia (as *e.g.* their use as a peace-offering for the Emperor), their constant burden is that of individual purification, the hope of salvation, or re-birth—the candidate was "renatus in aeternum" [4]—of death with the god and resurrection with him, of reconciliation through his blood, of participation in his *vires*. But it is obvious that this series of ideas runs parallel point by point with that which meets us in the explanations given authoritatively of Christian Baptism, and we are forced to conclude, therefore, that whatever the

[1] *Revue archéolog.* xii., 1888, pp. 132-6, but see Hepding, *Attis*, 1903, p. 201.

[2] Cumont, *Oriental Religions*, 1911, p. 65.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] It was usually for twenty years.

connection may be between the two series it is at least not factitious.[1]

This conclusion is strengthened by the reflection that a parallel in many other striking details meets us between Pagan and Christian forms. Thus it was in spring, to be precise, on March 24, that the *dies sanguinis* of the older and genuine taurobolium took place, succeeded by the *Hilaria*; a mystical burial took place at initiation;[2] milk and honey were given to the newly-born;[3] fasting preceded

[1] An inscription of A.D. 376 relates that Ulpius Egnatius Faventinus, a man of consular rank, public augur of the Roman people of Quirites, father and sacred herald of the sun-god, the unconquered Mithra, "archibucolus" of the God Liber, hierophant of Hecate, priest of Isis, the taurobolium and criobolium having been received on the ides of August, consecrated to the Great Gods (the Idaean Mother and Attis), and vowed that after twenty years he would again slay the "two-horned" with gilded forehead (*C.I.L.* vi. 504). In *C.I.L.* vi. 461 an altar is dedicated to the God Liber and given to "Spira," "a mystical college particularly devoted to the Bacchic religion"; in *C.I.L.* vi. 462, the same God is called "Liber ter Bromius" and "Silviger"; in *C.I.L.* vi. 467 he is "Magnus Liber, Pater et Adstator et Conserbator" of the place; in 468 "Liber Pater Sanctus"; in 488, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496 etc., the Great Mother is honoured; 497-504 also speak of her as worshipped with the taurobolium, while 490 is dedicated to Bellona. "Attis, Menotyrannus" occurs also in 499, 500. Even a cursory inspection of these inscriptions is enough to reveal the strength of Paganism in Rome in the fourth century —just before its official proscription by Theodosius, and the confiscation of its property by Gratian in 382. Cf. also Cumont, *Rev. d'histoire et de litt. rel.* viii. 417 ff. Cf. S. Dill, *Roman Society in the last Century of the Western Empire*, 1898, especially ch. iv. Espérandieu, *Inscriptions antiques de Lectoure*, pp. 112-118, gives a list of inscriptions in which the taurobolium occurs, and pp. 119-128 tables of names of offerers and objects. In two only (*C.I.L.* vi. 510, 736) does the phrase "in aeternum renatus" occur, which Espérandieu explains by suggesting that both offerers were too old to expect to live for twenty years. Cumont's remark, however (*ubi supra*, vi. 109), that the idea of regeneration had attached itself to the rite in Asia Minor long before its introduction into the Roman Empire seems more probable. Cf. also Zippel, *Festschrift zum Doctorjubilaum Ludw. Friedlander*, 1895, p. 489 ff.

[2] Proclus, in *Plat. theol.* iv., *e.g.*, speaks of the celebrants ordering the candidate to be buried, all except the head, in the most sacred ceremony of the initiations.

[3] Usener, *Rhein. Mus.*, 1902, 57, 177 ff.; Sallust, *Of Gods and the World*, c. 4. "Another Romano-Alexandrian peculiarity unknown to the

initiation;[1] forgiveness of sins attached to both;[2] the baptismal day (later the day of martyrdom or of ordination also) was " natalis sacer " ; exorcism, signing with the Cross, anointing, sufflation and the *abrenuntio* are all lineal descendants of practices of Paganism which were rooted in the belief of a corporeal entry by demons into the person of the initiand.[3]

Indeed, the more thoroughly the student steeps his mind in the beliefs and practices of pre-Christian religion, and the more closely he familiarises himself with the implicits of the early Christian practice of baptism,[4] as witnessed to, for example, by a Tertullian, the more clear becomes the dependence of the latter on the former.

But this fact, however well assured, is but half of the story, and perhaps not the most important

---

Oriental and Gallican rites, was the drink of milk and honey given to the neophytes after their first communion," Clement Al. *Paed.* i. 6. 35; Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 1903, p. 333; Duchesne, however, prefers to seek the original in the milk and honey of the Promised Land.

[1] Cf. *Didache*, vii.

[2] Cf. Tertullian, *De bapt.* c. 5: " Certe ludis Apollinaribus et Eleusiniis tinguuntur, idque se in regenerationem et impunitatem periuriorum suorum agere praesumunt."

[3] Cf. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 1903, pp. 304-313; cf. Porphyrius, *De phil. ex orac. haur.*, p. 148; Wolff, in Euseb. *Praep. evan.*, iv. 22: " When the priests drive out demons through the gift of the breath or blood of animals and through beating of the air, it is in order that, these departing, the coming of the god may take place. The house is full of them, and therefore they banish and drive them away when they call on God." See Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, 1910, p. 99.

[4] The " Elkesaites " attached supreme importance to baptism, which was performed in the name of the highest God and of His son, the Great King; and the candidate pledged himself to a pure life, calling on the seven witnesses—heaven, water, the holy spirits, the angels of prayer, oil, salt, and earth. That this exalted estimate of baptism rests on a Gnostic-mythic foundation is to be inferred from the statement of Epiphanius (*Haer.* 53) that the Elkesaites ' worship water as a god,' saying that from it came forth life " (O. Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, Eng. trans., 1910, iii. 139-140).

half. For while it records the part played by the Epigoni it omits the part of the Lord and His immediate disciples. He came to an age in which the boundary-lines between Greek and barbarian, Jew and Gentile were well-nigh obliterated, in which the religions of the Mediterranean basin and of West Asia were mingled in the crucible of a syncretistic philosophy, and by the magic of a spirit which was one with the Father, He drew out of them their permanent and spiritual essence and gave to that the full weight of His authority. And this He appears to have done without rejecting the existing forms decisively. It was enough to stamp them as subordinate and mutable, and then to leave those who had learned from Him what was essential to use their own discretion in the choice of fit forms and the rejection of unfit.

But this discrimination demands a choice of materials and presupposes a development and a refining process. In early culture no fixed line of demarcation exists between thoughts and things. Both are ruled by spirits and proceed from them, or are even inhabited by them. And one all-prevalent way of reconciling them with the spirit-world is by the use of water, oil, fat, or blood. All of these appear to have been used for religious or "magical" purposes as far back as our evidence goes, but as refinement of taste advanced blood found a surrogate in oil, and water retained its pristine force while enlarging its jurisdiction.[1] Thus there may be traced a steady progress from what sounds like materialistic conceptions to pure ethical or spiritual aims. We say "what sounds like materialistic conceptions," for it is not by any

[1] Jevons, *Introduction to the History of Religion*, 1896, p. 285.

means certain that all who heard the Pope's words in blessing the oils would take them at their face value.

Emitte, quaesumus Domine, Spiritum sanctum Paraclitum de caelis in hanc pinguedinem olei, quam de viridi ligno producere dignatus es ad refectionem mentis et corporis, et tua sancta benedictione sit omni ungenti, gustanti, tangenti, tutamentum mentis et corporis, animae et spiritus ad evacuandos omnes dolores, omnem infirmitatem, omnem aegritudinem mentis et corporis, unde unxisti sacerdotes, reges et prophetas et martyres, Chrisma tuum perfectum a te, Domine, benedictum, permanens in visceribus nostris in nomine Domini nostri Iesu Christi.[1]

That the crude view here expressed does not exclude a more refined may be conjectured from Tertullian's words :

The flesh is washed that the soul may be cleansed ; the flesh is anointed that the soul may be consecrated ; the flesh is signed that the soul may be fortified ; the flesh is shadowed by the laying-on of the hand that the soul may be illuminated by the spirit ; the flesh is fed by the body and blood of Christ that the soul may be fattened for God.[2]

We may conclude then this scanty notice of a great subject by repeating that Jesus (1) found to His hand a pre-existing ceremony of initiatory baptism ; (2) that He distinguished what in it was of the eternal order and what of the temporal ; (3) that having impressed on His immediate disciples this distinction He left them to express it in the terms they thought best ; and (4) that as a matter of fact they expressed His truth in terms borrowed

[1] Duchesne, *ubi supra*, p. 306.
[2] *De resurr.* 8.

from pre-existing ceremonies ; [1] to which may be added (5) that even if Pagan and Christian are found using the same expressions it does not follow that they meant the same thing.

So far as Baptism implied the subsequent fulness of Christian blessings the Article of the Communion of Saints, in the sense in which we are now considering it, would affirm that Christians enjoyed as such a common share in the Spirit bestowed in Baptism.[2]

Holy Communion

The " holy thing " par excellence which members of the Church share in common is their Holy Communion, and the source from which the *forms* of this have been borrowed is even more obviously Pagan than in the case of Baptism. This appears negatively from the complete failure of every writer, from Zwingli to the " Catechism of the Council of Trent," to trace any even plausible connection between the Christian Eucharist and the Jewish Passover. In this latter a lamb was slain and eaten, according to the orthodox explanation, in order to commemorate a great historical deliverance of the Israelites, and so far it was not necessarily more

[1] " Depuis quelques années, les recherches de plusieurs savants ingénieux ont mis hors de doute que le christianisme des premiers siècles, moins juif qu'hellénique dès l'origine, a été fortement imprégné d'orphisme " (S. Reinach, *Cultes, mythes et religions*, 1906, ii. 83).

[2] Cf. Espérandieu, *ubi supra*, p. 97 : " Towards the end of the republic, and in the early days of the Empire, doubt in matters of religion gave way to the need of belief, which completely transformed Paganism and prepared the way for the religion of Christ by furnishing it with a soil on which its teaching could not but bear fruit." Cf. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 66 ; Tertullian, *De bapt.* 5, and *De praescr. haer.* 40. Both the Church and Mithraism borrowed their *forms* from earlier cults, but each put into the forms its own spirit, and this was different.

religious than a Trafalgar-day celebration. To it a meal was adjoined which was partaken of by each family at home after the lamb slain in the Temple had been brought home—its blood having been first caught in a golden bowl and "jerked in a jet at the base of the altar." [1] The dilemma in which those are caught who trace the Eucharist to this ceremony as celebrated at the time of Christ is this: if, as with scholastic theology, the religious side is given due weight, as indeed it should be, then the phrase, "This is My Body," in which a Divine sacrifice is enshrined, is one which to Jewish piety is anathema. If, on the other hand, the ceremony is eviscerated and its religious heart removed, as Protestant theology has done, then nothing is left for the student of religion to take note of. The anthropologist may refer the social meal, the Lord's Supper, to similar feasts of good fellowship, but he can hardly find anything in it specifically religious. We shall have saved the Jewish parentage by rejecting the Christian meaning.

Nor is the case altered if we refer the Passover as celebrated in the first Christian century to a conflation of (1) an early Jewish tribal harvest-sacrifice connected with the moon, and (2) a blood-rite which appeased the Hausgötter. For this gives us on one of its two sides a *chag*, *i.e.* "a mirthful festival with dances and processions and joyous sacrificial meal," in no way different from the feasts of Paganism held universally at the vernal equinox. On its other side, we meet another world-wide ceremony which uses blood as the most efficacious and most mysterious instrument of establishing communion with the Deity. In neither case, there-

[1] Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii. 488.

fore, are we dealing with a ceremony which bears a peculiarly Jewish character.[1]

But it may be said that in any case the fact remains that this great world-wide system of feast and sacrifice, common to Pagan and Jew, did at all events percolate into the Christian Church through the Jewish channel. To this the answer is that no Jew, as a Jew, could possibly regard a phrase which implied the eating of his God as other than a blasphemy. He might indeed think of God as the house-father providing a feast and inviting him to be His guest, but unless he had first abjured his national modes of thought he could not think of God offering His own body to be eaten. Yet this is what is meant by the words " This is My Body," and scholastic theology has been at once more true to history and more honest in insisting that the phrase means what it says. Protestant theology, on the other hand, is neither honest nor true to history in taking the phrase in a non-natural sense, and the shifts it has been put to are sufficient proof of the unsoundness of its presupposition.[2]

It is only when we step on to a larger stage that the antecedents of the Christian form declare themselves. In all ethnic religions the sacrificial meal bears a uniform meaning, and confers a uniform gift. Man is by nature compelled to seek union with his God, and in the savage and in the barbarian

[1] " It would seem that the influence of the Paschal feast on the Christian rite was not direct. It was necessary to revert from it to an earlier point in the main stem of sacrificial belief, and thus Pagan Mystery had closer analogy than Jewish rite " (Percy Gardner, *Exploratio evangelica*, 1899, p. 457).

[2] " Paul cannot have drawn his doctrines of the mystical ceremonies of Baptism and the Lord's Supper from the tradition of the Christian community, because this tradition before his time knew nothing of these doctrines " (O. Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, Eng. trans., 1910, i. 63).

stage he has sought to effect this union with his God by eating Him.[1] "The sacrificial and sacramental meal, which from the beginning has been the centre of all religion, has from the beginning also always been a moment in which the consciousness has been present to man of communion with the god of his prayers—without that consciousness man had no motive to continue the practice of the rite. In the beginning, again, the sacramental meal required, for the annual renewal of the blood-covenant, that the worshipper should partake of the body and blood of the victim."[2] So to drink the blood of sacrifice was to secure the indwelling of the god who gave the prophecy. To anoint a stone with blood, fat, or oil made the stone a shrine in which the god came to dwell. To dress an idol in the skin of the sacred victim "ensured the god's actual presence in the idol." Father Acotsa's account of the native religion he found in Mexico makes it clear that the Mexicans killed the god Huitzilopochtli so that his body might be eaten; this was done to a dough idol which was shown to the people, then broken in pieces and distributed to the communicants. Certain Saracens, whose sacrifice is described by Robertson Smith, after Nilus,[3] killed a camel, hacked off pieces of the quivering flesh and devoured them raw, and all between the rising of the morning star and the rising of the sun. But there is no need to illustrate

[1] "Ce n'était pas seulement une allusion à la passion de Zagreus et à son démembrement par les Titans; comme le taureau est une des formes de Dionysos, c'était le corps du dieu dont se repaissaient symboliquement les initiés, c'était son sang dont ils s'abreuvaient dans ce banquet mystique. Ils croyaient ainsi faire descendre en eux Dionysos et remplir son âme de sa divinité" (Decharme, *Mythologie de la Grèce*, p. 438).

[2] Jevons, *ubi supra*, p. 285.

[3] *Religion of the Semites*, p. 338.

further a mode of thought which is now familiar and abundantly supported by evidence.[1]

But we are not dependent on distant cults for explanation of the Christian Communion. At the beginning of our era the "Mysteries" of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt were widely spread throughout the Roman Empire,[2] and all three countries figure in the accepted history of the origins of Christianity. Moreover, the syncretistic process had advanced so far that the various deities were regarded as doubles of one another, or as aspects of one supreme Power, or as subordinates of one Most High God—Hypsistos. It was impossible that the new religion could start free from all relationship to these omnipresent cults. Cumont,[3] for example, draws attention to the strange fact, for which no satisfactory explanation has as yet been furnished, "that a priest of Sabazius was buried in the Christian catacomb of Praetextatus," and he adds, "undoubtedly he belonged to a Jewish-pagan sect that admitted neophytes of every race to its mystic ceremonies. In fact, the Church itself formed a kind of secret society sprung from the synagogue but distinct from it, in which Gentiles and the Children of Israel joined in a

[1] Jevons gives other instances, *ubi supra*, ch. xii.

[2] According to the unknown author of the *Ambrosiaster* (*circa* 374–382), Pagan rites were openly practised at Rome in his time; the tumultuous orgies of the Bacchanals were celebrated; the dog-headed Anubis was carried through the streets in the processions of Isis, and in dark caves Mithras tested and initiated his votaries, while the Galli of the Mater Magna commemorated the death of Attis by a taurobolium on March 24—their *dies sanguinis*—followed by the Hilaria. St. Jerome's words are well known: "Bethlehem nunc nostram lucus inumbrabat Thamuz, id est, Adonidis, et in specu, ubi quondam Christus parvulus vagiit, Veneris amasius plangebatur" (*Ep.* 58 in Migne, Pl. xxii. 581). Similarly, Firmicus Maternus testifies that in his time the Cretans celebrated the *trieterica* of Dionysos, and ate the sacrificial bull alive, c. 6. 5.

[3] *Oriental Religions*, p. 65.

common adoration." If we substitute Christian for Jewish in this quotation and eliminate the reference to the synagogue the explanation will at all events be less difficult.

Thus we find Sabazius confounded with Attis or equated with Osiris, and Isis identified with Cybele. Moreover, the title *Hypsistos* in common use at the beginning of our era points if not to monotheism at all events to monolatry. "The goatherds and shepherds think that one god (rules) this world, whether he be Hypsistos, or Adonis, or Sabaoth, or however they prefer to name him," is the dictum of Celsus.[1] Now one rite common to the ethnic cults which surrounded Christianity at its birth was that of attaining union with the god by eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the animal in which he was thought to be incarnate. First conceived under the crude idea that so his life, his *vires*, was imparted to the worshipper, it was afterwards raised to a religious concept by being made the vehicle of a higher life. From the circle of generation it rose to the circle of regeneration. As men's conception of the nature of deity was refined, so their conception of the nature of the sacrificial feast also grew more exalted. And it is just here that Christianity stepped in and spoiled the Egyptians by borrowing their jewels and placing them at the service of a higher God.

It has been pointed out already that the practice of "eating the god" is alien to Jewish soil and native to Pagan, and that therefore Christian

[1] Origen, *Contra Celsum*, i. 24; cf. *C.I.L.* vi. 509, which gives an inscription from an altar at Naples, dated A.D. 370. Its first two lines run:

"To Rhea, mother of all things . . . and parent,
And to Attis Hypsistos and sustainer of the whole."

expressions which refer to the eating the body and drinking the blood of Jesus Christ cannot proceed from a Jewish source. The failure of nearly all exegetes to recognise the ethnic origin of the supernatural nature of the Eucharist accounts for the unconvincing character of their exposition of passages such as John vi. 51-57. This passage is, from any point of view, remarkable for its uncompromising and almost harsh assertion that the body and blood consumed are real body and real blood. It is not, indeed, until we take the context into account that we realise that the writer is moving in the mystical upper-air, and that to him reality is in the ideal world. The Son of Man whose flesh is given for food is essentially a spiritual being clad in a cognate body. Hence His flesh is not physical flesh nor His blood physical blood, but a higher flesh and blood of which the lower and ordinary are analogues. The eating and drinking are not figurative eating and drinking, as a sterile Protestantism pretends, but are actual.[1] In the inner sphere of existence are a *real* food, a *real* drink, and a *real* eating and drinking; their analogues on the plane of ordinary experience are shadowy in comparison, as the "heaven" from which the "flesh" comes down is more real than the "earth" which breaks with its teeth this "flesh," and so assimilates it.

It is singular that in the voluminous disputes about the meaning of the phrase, "This is My Body," emphasis is seldom, if ever, laid on the

[1] It is noteworthy that a particularly coarse word, τρώγων, is deliberately chosen in vv. 54, 56, 58, so as to emphasise the actuality of the process of eating, and to exclude all merely imaginative or figurative modes of explaining away the mystery.

distinctive word. What noun *this* is to be attached to, what is meant by *body*, and whether *is* is a mere copulative verb of undefined content are each disputed, but it does not occur to anybody to point to the fact that the governing word is " My." The nature of the Person determines the nature of the body broken and given. If that Person were of " earth " His body would be palpable and divisible ; but if He be of Heaven it can be neither. And it would seem that it is nothing but our ingrained habit of feeling (I do not say thinking) that the material is real and the spiritual unreal which shuts our eyes to the true meaning of " This is My Body."

This meaning would be clear enough if it were set against the Dionysiac and similar liturgical feasts as the writer of the Fourth Gospel sets it. For, in these feasts the worshipper in eating the sacred victim extracted from it the life of the god who had identified himself with the victim. At the meal of the Thesmophoria the worshippers partook of the body of Demeter when they eat swine's flesh ; [1] so the fact that fish were sacred to Demeter,[2] and were eaten on Friday in honour of Venus, illustrates the original reason for eating fish on certain days ; [3] " the rending and devouring of live

[1] Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 1890, ii. 47 ; the worshippers of Attis and presumably of Adonis did not in ordinary life kill or eat pigs, but this " does not exclude the possibility that in these cults the pig was slain on solemn occasions as a representative of the god, and consumed sacramentally by the worshippers " (*ibid.* p. 51) ; the same is true of the Israelites, at least sometimes, and perhaps in the beginning ; " once a year the Egyptians sacrificed pigs to the moon and to Osiris, and not only sacrificed them, but ate of their flesh " (*ibid.* p. 52).

[2] Pausanias, i. 38.

[3] Cf. Hepding, *Attis*, p. 189 ; and Cumont, *Oriental Religions*, p. 246. It is as god, not as animal, that the totem furnishes the sacrificial meal (Jevons, *Introduction to the History of Religion*, p. 154).

bulls and calves appear to have been a regular feature of the Dionysiac rites." [1]

Now if we set over against the N.T. sayings about eating the body and drinking the blood of the Son of Man the numerous parallels from ethnic cults which the industry of Mannhardt, Frazer, Cumont, Hartland, Farnell, and many other scholars have collected, it would seem impossible to avoid the conclusion that the two sets belong to the same circle of thought. From which it would follow that while the Christian retains its connection with the older religious beliefs and practices, it yet transcends them by fulfilling them. In a profound sense it came "unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times,[2] and bestowed the aeonian life upon the ancient forms which men of older times had dimly felt after, and vaguely expressed in the forms which were to be one day fulfilled when the Lord of life appeared." [3]

The "Communion in holy things," then, while covering the whole ground of religious truths and ordinances, which are common to the Christian

[1] Frazer, *ubi supra*, i. 326.

[2] Eph. i. 10.

[3] "It is perhaps worth remarking that the fact of certain elements being common ground between Christianity and other religions may be regarded, not as discrediting those elements, but rather as proving their essential congruity with a universal instinct of religious humanity" (A. E. J. Rawlinson, in *Foundations*, p. 401 *n.*). A more thorough-going criticism meets us in the *Ecce Deus* of W. B. Smith, 1912, p. 124: "This weighty thought of complete appropriation of the 'New Doctrine' under the emblems of wine and bread (of life) has found impressive symbolic expression in the Eucharist." Cf. Philo, *Leg. Alleg.* iii. 26 (1. 103): "But let Melchizedech give wine instead of water, and refresh and strengthen souls that they may be possessed by a divine intoxication more sober than 'sobriety' itself." Clement Al. refers to this passage in *Strom.* iv. 25, in saying that Christ is the King of Peace, who gives bread and wine as the consecrated food in the Eucharist. But in Philo and Clement alike this food is Light, Gnosis, Knowledge of God given by Logos, priest of the Most-high God.

community, seems to put prominently forward the two Sacraments, and to use them as comprehensive of all the rest. In doing this it, however, does not directly raise the question what, if any, part of these sacraments is of ethnic origin, or how such a part is to be brought into union with that which is specifically Christian. But seeing that the question cannot be put on one side we reply that the form belongs to the world-religions while the spirit and meaning and efficacy belong to the Spirit of Christ.[1] *Mutatis mutandis*, the same holds good of the Sacraments.

[1] Cf. the Rev. W. Temple in *Foundations*, 1912, p. 258 : " Our analogies break down. We may help ourselves towards an understanding of His Divinity by means of the formula, ' The form of His consciousness is Human, while its content is Divine ' ; we may help ourselves towards an understanding of His Humanity by interpreting its inclusiveness in the terms of our social nature ; but we know that neither attempt leads us to the heart of the mystery."

CHAPTER XXIII

THE TENTH ARTICLE

The Forgiveness of Sins

Ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν

In a letter of Charlemagne written to the Bishops of Spain in connection with the Council of Frankfort in A.D. 794 is the phrase: "We preach one holy Church of God scattered throughout the whole world, though separated in place, united in faith and charity; and a true remission of sins in the same Church whether through baptism or penance, the Divine grace giving it, and Man's will co-operating." [1] The reference here to two modes of obtaining forgiveness of sins is useful as combining two explanations of the insertion of the Article in the Creed. According to Briggs, "the *remission of sins* of the Creed is the remission of sins connected with baptism and the entrance into the Christian Church, as is evident from the specification of the remission of sins given in several creeds and contemporary writers." [2] McGiffert, on the other hand, points out that in the Creeds of Irenaeus and

[1] "Praedicamus unam sanctam Dei ecclesiam toto orbe diffusam, locis separatam, fide et caritate coniunctam, et veram remissionem peccatorum in eadem ecclesia sive per baptismum sive poenitentiam, divina donante gratia et bona voluntate hominis cooperante" (Mansi, xiii., 1905; Lumby, *History of the Creeds*, 1873, p. 235).

[2] *Fundamental Christian Faith*, p. 196.

Tertullian no reference to remission of sins is made at all. It is also lacking in the *Didascalia* and in Origen's references to the Creed, and in the Canones Hippolyti,[1] and in all probability in the Old Roman Symbol. The Creed of Antioch of the third century contains *remission of sins*. The Creed of Jerusalem [2] contains it and connects it with one baptism. The form of Athanasius is " one baptism of repentance and remission of sins " ; [3] the Nicene Creed stopped at the article of the Holy Ghost. The article of *remission of sins* was absent from all Creeds before the time of Cyprian, and the reference to the one baptism does not appear before the middle of the fourth century. From which it seems to follow that the insertions followed the course of ecclesiastical events, and that McGiffert is right in referring the insertion of *remission of sins* to the Novatian controversy.[4]

For our purpose, however, we may consider *remission of sins* as covering from the eighth century onwards both modes, viz. (*a*) baptism, and (*b*) penance.

(*a*) *Forgiveness of Sins through Baptism*

We must distinguish two conceptions of forgiveness corresponding to two conceptions of sin, the one material or semi-material, and the other spiritual. The former was the belief of the many (whether educated or uneducated seems to have made little difference), and the latter was taught by mystics and apparently by them alone. The Liturgies of Baptism and the writers of the early Church witness with sufficient clearness to the popular view.

[1] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 1903, p. 533. [2] *Circa* 347.
[3] Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, p. 7. [4] *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 160.

In this view uncleanness was due to contact with evil spirits, and purification was the annulling of the stain they had made. This purification was effected through exorcism, and exorcism was thought of as the formal act of a higher power through which the demons were driven out. This view was common to Jew and Gentile alike. Tabus, whatever their name, were found wherever things were which were thought to convey contagion. Birth and death, all things connected with sex, blood, things belonging to gods or offered to them, anything, in short, which might have been touched by demons, and so have transmitted a maleficent influence, were regarded as tabu and when touched calling for purification. Sickness in general was accounted for by the influence of evil spirits, and the power of a curse lay in the calling-in by it of a demon.

From such uncleanness men were freed by the due use of appropriate means. Water was in general use as a purifying instrument, especially running water or the water of the sea. If the uncleanness was severe many running streams must be sought, or, what is the same thing, the sick Naaman must dip many times in the same living stream. Blood might be expiated by blood, hence sacrifices of human beings or of animals, and hence the custom of sprinkling blood whether on the altar or on the person needing to be cleansed. Rubbing as with squills, fire, the smoke of sacrifice or of incense, were all efficacious in the expelling of demons.[1]

[1] Rohde, *Psyche*, pp. 359-368; Smend, *Alttest. Religionsgeschichte*, 148 f.; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, ii. pp. 770-776; Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 243 ff.; Dieterich, *Abrasax*, 136-148; Crawley, *The Mystic Rose*, 1902.

The conception of infection by demons (or possession) and the consequent need of purification from them passed into the Christian Church.

In the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 6) the deacon is bidden to say :

Ye energumens, afflicted with unclean spirits, pray, and let us all earnestly pray for them, that God, the lover of mankind, will by Christ rebuke the unclean and wicked spirits, and deliver His supplicants from the dominion of the adversary. May He that rebuked the legion of demons, and the devil, the prince of wickedness, even now rebuke these apostates from piety, and deliver His own workmanship from his power, and cleanse those creatures which He has made with great wisdom.

And again in ch. xxix. when the bishop blesses water and oil Matthias bids him pray :

O Lord of hosts, the God of powers, do Thou now sanctify this water and this oil through Thy Christ in the name of him or her that has offered them, and grant them a power to restore health, to drive away diseases, to banish demons and to disperse all snares through Christ our hope.

And in ch. xxxii. :

If any one hath a demon let him be taught godliness, but not received into communion before he be cleansed.[1]

In Bishop Sarapion's Prayer-book[2] is a prayer, No. 17, " in regard to oil of the sick or for bread or for water " which contains the following :

We pray Thee to send healing power of the only-begotten from heaven upon this oil, that it may become to those

[1] The *Apostolic Constitutions* is a compilation made in Syria or Palestine, in the third century, written in Greek and translated into Syriac. See Harnack, *Die altchrist. Lit., die Überlief.* pp. 515-518, and Hauch, *Realency.* i. 734 ff.

[2] Ed. by Wobberman and Wordsworth, 1899.

who are being anointed (with it), or are partaking of these Thy creatures, for a throwing-off of every sickness and every infirmity, for a charm against every demon, for a separation of every unclean spirit, for an expulsion of every evil spirit, for a driving-out of all fever and ague, and every infirmity, for good grace and remission of sins, for a medicine of life and salvation, for health and soundness of soul, body, spirit for perfect strengthening. O Master, let every Satanic energy, every demon, every device of the adversary, every plague, every scourge, every pain, every labour or stroke, or shaking, or evil shadowing, fear Thy holy name which we have now invoked.

In the *Testament of our Lord* [1] it is written :

Grant, O Lord, that every proud conception may be driven away from us by Thy Name which is written within the veils of Thy sanctuaries, those high ones—a Name which, when Sheol heareth it it is amazed, the depth is rent, the spirits are driven away, the dragon is bruised, unbelief is cast out, disobedience is subdued, etc.

In a formula for the exorcising of the baptismal water given by Duchesne [2] from the *Missale Gothicum* we read :

I exorcise thee, O creature of water, I exorcise thee, the whole army of the devil, every power of the adversary, every shade of demons. I exorcise thee in the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ the Nazarene, who was incarnate in Mary the Virgin, to whom the Father has subjected all things in heaven and in earth. Fear and tremble, thou and all thy malice : give place to the Holy Spirit, that to all who may descend into this fount it may be a laver of regeneration of baptism for the remission of all sins : through our Lord, Jesus Christ, Who will come in the throne of the majesty of the Father with His holy angels to judge thee, thou enemy, and the world by fire, for ever and ever.

---

[1] Ed. Cooper and Maclean, 1902, p. 74. [2] *Christian Worship*, p. 322.

What the rites say the doctors also say. For example, Athanasius, *De incarn. Verb.* c. 30, says :

> Where Christ is named and His faith thence all idolatry is purged away, every fallacy of demons is confuted, every demon is unable to bear the name, but, what is more, on hearing it only, he takes to flight.

Origen sets the name of Jesus alongside of Sabaoth, Adonai, or whatever powerful names might be used for wonder-working among Hebrews, Egyptians, and Persians, as having plainly shown its power to cast out demons from souls and bodies.[1] Moreover, he hints that a form of the Creed was used in exorcism when he says that the name of Jesus *with the history about Him* had cured many from accidents, ecstasies, madnesses, and myriads of other ills of which neither men nor demons could cure them. The reference is to the use of the name and the creed in Baptism.[2]

So Chrysostom says, preaching on Col. iii. 17, that if you say with faith " In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost " you have accomplished everything. It was through this terrible name that the world was overturned, tyranny ended, the devil trodden under foot, the heavens opened, and we born again. The reference is clearly to Baptism.

That this conception of Baptism as the moment of passing from the power of devils to the service of Christ is no later corruption of the third or

[1] *Contra Celsum*, i. c. 25.

[2] *Ibid.* iii. 24 ; in i. 6, he again speaks of Christians having power over demons through the name of Jesus, and a *proclamation of the histories* about Him, and rejects the assertion of Celsus that they *seemed* to work their wonders through enchantments.

fourth centuries is clear from Justin Martyr. In his *Dialogue with Trypho* (c. 30) he says :

> We call Him helper and redeemer, the power of whose name even demons do fear ; and at this day when they are exorcised in the name of Jesus Christ, crucified under Pontius Pilate, governor of Judaea, they are overcome.

A similar assertion of the power of the Name and of its baptismal use occurs in ch. 85 :

> Every demon when exorcised in the name of this very Son of God—who is the First-born of every creature, who became man by the Virgin ; who suffered and was crucified under Pontius Pilate by your nation, who died, who rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven—is overcome and subdued.

In the *Second Apology* (c. 6) Justin says :

> Numberless demoniacs throughout the whole world, and in your city many of our Christian men exorcising them in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, have healed and do heal, rendering helpless and driving the possessing devils out of the men, though they could not be cured by all the other exorcists and those who used incantations and drugs.[1]

Irenaeus does not so clearly refer the expulsion of demons to baptism, but suggests rather that it took place by an exorcism " in the Name " prior to any baptism, although it often led to baptism and entrance into the Church.[2] He also refers to men being saved before the coming of Christ by invocation of the name of the Most High and the Almighty from evil spirits of all sorts.[3]

But though the evidence is ample for the pro-

[1] *Dial.* xlix. lxxvi., Ap. ii. 8.
[2] Harvey's Irenaeus, lib. ii. 49. 3.
[3] *Ibid.* ii. 4. 6. Cf. also Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 23.

position that the forgiveness of sins conferred in Christian Baptism was understood to consist in the abolition, or washing away, of the taint that came from contact with demons, yet there is also ample evidence for the further proposition that forgiveness of sins as effected by baptism was of a moral or spiritual order.[1] And the case is not to be conceived as though the latter and purer view grew out of the former and more material, for the two were synchronous. What is to be thought is that some held the one view and some the other in the same group and in the same generation. The upholders of the spiritual view, if we follow the teaching of all experience, were the minority, and this minority formed by their very existence a standing protest against the lower view. Both are to be found in pre-Christian times, and both passed over into the Church. The history of the "forgiveness of sin" in Church thought then becomes a history of the gradual suppression of the lower conception by the higher. We may, if we will, call the latter conception *Christian* and the former *Catholic*, and this gives us a view of history as the slow transmutation (not annihilation) of Catholic forms by the Christian spirit.

But the term "Christian spirit" is vague and

[1] Clement of Alexandria, for example, says: "The Believer received from the Lord forgiveness of sins (at Baptism); but the Gnostic sins no more, and provides from himself forgiveness" (*Ecl. Proph.* 15). On which Dr. Bigg's note is: "It should be observed that forgiveness in Clement's mind signifies not merely the cancelling of a penalty, but the cure of that ignorance which is the cause and strength of sin. Sin done before Baptism in darkness does not necessarily imply badness of heart; hence for this no remedy is necessary except light. In all other cases the penalty is itself the earnest of forgiveness" (*Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, 2nd ed., p. 104).

unsatisfactory and wanting in precision. There is no recognisable Christian spirit; what there is is the Spirit of Christ, a definite, personal, and real Spirit which in history was (and is) Jesus Christ and His Church. This Spirit when placed at the bar of law, or logic, declines to say a word, because words and words' souls, thought, cannot comprehend Him. To Life, however, He stands clearly revealed, and His authority may be recognised in the " signs " He does, the truth He illuminates, and the men He saves.

Yet though Life be superior to reason it must submit to logic when it enters into the forms of experience. The Church, therefore, must respect the requirements of logic if it is to win and retain men's allegiance, for, as Dr. McTaggart says, " None ever went about to break logic but in the end logic broke him." [1] Hence though forgiveness of sins as a living process transcends experience it yet as a fact of experience is amenable to reason. And Christian experience makes it the third with sin and repentance as a vital act. Sin it pronounces to be self-will, and repentance the moving of the soul under grace out of self-will into Love, and forgiveness is what happens when the crescent love within the soul meets the full love of God. When this takes place the soul has lost itself only to find itself. Forgiveness is union with God.

Two Parables in the Gospels set out clearly the nature of Christian forgiveness, viz. those of the Unmerciful Servant and of the Prodigal Son.[2] In the first, forgiveness is based on brotherhood, that

[1] *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*, p. 292, § 312.

[2] In what follows I have made use of an article contributed by me to Dr. Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. vi., entitled " Forgiveness, New Testament and Christian."

is, on community of nature as between man and man, and consequently on the relation of Father and Son, that is again, on community of nature as between God and man. For the ground of forgiveness is the same in both cases. In the Parable of the Prodigal Son we have set out with equal clearness and even more attractiveness the same relation between love and forgiveness. The Father's love is always a potential energy waiting for the spring to be touched which shall release it in action, and that spring is touched by the desire of the Prodigal for his home, joined to its expression in his changed life and return. The elder brother is the analogue of the unmerciful servant, in so far as his self-centred habit of soul shuts him out automatically from any share in that selfless love which does not weigh merit or demerit, but gives itself freely where there is willingness to receive it.

The full force, however, of the N.T. teaching on forgiveness is not given due expression until it is correlated with another law of the Christian life. Nothing is more familiar to readers of the N.T. than an antithesis which occurs constantly, though in varied forms. The Publicans are set over against the Pharisees; the "Elect" against the "called"; the spirit against the flesh; the son against the slave; grace against the law; heaven against earth; faith against sight, and so on. But what has not been sufficiently observed is that these different antitheses are expressions for one and the same opposition between two states of the soul. One of these is described as carnal (*e.g.* in 1 Cor. iii. 3); or as psychical (*e.g.* in 1 Cor. ii. 14); or as walking by sight (2 Cor. v. 7); or as the lust of the flesh (Gal. v. 16); or as being under law (Gal.

v. 18); or as being a slave (Gal. iv. 7); or in darkness (Luke i. 79, John i. 5, Acts xxvi. 18, etc.); or in outer darkness (Matt. xxii. 13). The other is described as the Kingdom of God (Luke xvii. 21, Rom. xiv. 17); as light (1 John i. 7); as life (Rom. viii. 10); salvation (Luke iii. 6); faith (Gal. iii. 5); liberty (Rom. viii. 21). The very richness and variety of the terms used to describe the two states are an indication on the one hand that as living processes they do not lend themselves to definition, and on the other that they express something which has the mark of reality.

Moreover, other passages indicate a passage from one state to the other. Christians have passed from death into life (1 John iii. 14, John v. 24); from darkness to light (Acts xxvi. 18); the whole creation is to pass from bondage to liberty (Rom. viii. 21); the disciples have ceased to be servants of sin and have become servants of righteousness (Rom. vi. 17); those that were slaves have become sons (Gal. iv. 5); the saints have been translated into the Kingdom of God's Son (Col. i. 13); they were raised with Christ (Col. iii. 1).

The moment which marks the transition is defined as being born again (John iii. 3), as regeneration (Titus iii. 5), as conversion (Matt. xviii. 3, Luke xxii. 32, Acts iii. 19), as an opening of the eyes (Acts xxvi. 18, John ix. 14, Luke xxiv. 31), or of the heavens (John i. 51, Matt. iii. 16, Acts vii. 56, x. 11, Rev. iv. 1), or of the understanding (Luke xxiv. 45). The subjective factor in the transaction is called ordinarily repentance (Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17, Luke xiii. 3, Acts ii. 38, iii. 19, xvii. 30, xxvi. 20), or repentance joined with faith (Acts xx. 21).

The precise character of the process which leads

to forgiveness must be duly emphasised before any clear conception can be gained of the nature of Christian forgiveness. From the above it is clear that two psychological conditions are sharply contrasted, viz. the psychical and the spiritual, the former of which is characterised by want of freedom and the latter by the possession of it. The one revolves round the lower-self, and the other round God, and hence one is the realm of disorder and the other of order, in much the same way that a geocentric centre of the universe leaves confused what a heliocentric reduces to order. The act which "translates" the soul is not man's but God's, though man has his work to do in preparing himself for the re-creative act of God—faith is the human face of grace. When the cup of the soul is emptied of self and purified from the dregs of earth the wine of heaven is poured into it from above, and the man is born into a new order, the spiritual, out of the old order, the psychical, and he is a new creature, for the old things are past and gone, and all things have become new (2 Cor. v. 17). The annulment of the old is called in the technical language of religion *forgiveness*.[1]

(*b*) *Forgiveness of Sins through "Penance"*

The history of the conception of forgiveness in days after those of the N.T. is a history of the struggle of the two forces of Life and Form to

[1] "On the merely moral level self-righteousness is possible, on the higher religious level it is not; hence 'there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance.' For such repentance is a new birth into a higher life; but it is not deliverance from innate depravity: it is truly an advance on all that existed before, not a restoration of pristine innocence" (James Ward, *The Realm of Ends*, 1912, p. 371).

establish an equipoise. It might be contended with some plausibility that the equipoise was seldom, if ever, actualised, and that at the best any approximation to it was due to a more or less bitter and persistent hostility between different Churches, or different sections in the same Church. Nor is it difficult to see why this should be the case, for the " mystic " nature of forgiveness as portrayed in the N.T. was too lofty for human nature's daily food, and hence it might be predicted beforehand that means would be found to give the inner process known as " forgiveness " some concrete form or statement which might be intelligible to the ordinary Churchman. This was effected as part of that development of the life of the Church which came to be known as Catholicism, and was carried out with growing decision and thoroughness from the date of the " peace of the Church," A.D. 313. The dominant form it took was that of the " sacrament of penance."

The efficient cause of the establishment of this sacrament was to be found in that secularisation of the Church which was produced by its recognition by the Empire and the consequent crowding into it of men and women of all grades of piety. The majority, and especially after the conversion of the barbarians, were but children in religion and demanded elementary methods of discipline and training. These were found in the authority which came to be vested in the leaders of the Church by which they were enabled to exclude from the community certain classes of sinners for varying periods, especially those guilty of murder, idolatry, and adultery. On repentance, however, the excommunicated person might after public confession

and promise of amendment be reinstated. Out of this salutary custom of forgiving on terms those who had confessed and expiated their sins *against the Church* there grew gradually a custom of another kind and more searching activity, viz. the confession of sins *against God* in which was involved also the substitution of the priest for the Church as the absolving authority.

The machinery thus established lay with a heavy weight on the mediaeval world. Eugenius IV. instructed the Armenians that the sacraments of the new Law were seven, of which the fourth was Penance; that the matter of this sacrament consisted in the three acts of contrition, confession, and satisfaction, that the words of absolution were its form, a duly authorised priest its minister, and its effect the forgiveness of sins. Martin V. condemned those who maintained that all exterior confession was superfluous and useless where the sinner was duly contrite; and he also directed that all Hussites should be interrogated whether they believed that besides contrition of heart it was necessary to salvation to confess to a priest only and not to a layman, however good and devout he might be. Sixtus IV. condemned the proposition that there was no obligation to confess evil thoughts since they were blotted out by aversion to them without recourse to the Keys; he condemned also the proposition that confession should be secret, *i.e.* of secret sins and not of open sins.

To the sacrament of penance as an instrument of forgiveness there was added later a system of indulgences under which the Church dispensed from the temporal pains of Purgatory not merely canonical or notorious sinners, but all, whether living or

departed, who by themselves, or vicariously, performed certain prescribed ecclesiastical exercises, such as saying given prayers, attending given offices, or paying fixed sums of money. This form of forgiveness of sins, however justified theoretically, can hardly be recognised as akin to the forgiveness of sins described in the N.T.

Accordingly, in the sixteenth century, the whole of the existing ecclesiastical doctrine and practice in the matter of the forgiveness of sins was challenged in the name of the N.T. It was no accident which led Luther to direct his attack on Indulgences, but a true insight into the fact that these were the logical outcome of a long historical process which was a corruption rather than a development. The liberty of every Christian man was destroyed by the priesthood; the Church Catholic had banished or buried the Church of Christ; ecclesiastical law had taken over the rôle of that condemned by St. Paul; the transaction of ceremonies had overlaid the piety of the heart; and a mechanical and external forgiveness of sins had ousted forgiveness as dynamic and proper to the individual.

The battle thus begun waged round the word "justification," which hence bore an extended connotation, being made to cover the fundamental difference of *Lebensanschauung* which marked the Reformers from the Romans, and was crystallised by the decrees of the Council of Trent on the one side, and by numerous Confessions of Faith and Articles of Religion on the other. Unfortunately it was a hard necessity laid on the Reformers that they were compelled to attempt to solve a religious problem by logic and by means which St. Paul called "carnal." Forgiveness, as we have seen

above, is of a spiritual nature, that is, it belongs to a sphere where Reason is not so much contradicted as transcended, but it was pulled down by the New Learning into the world of Reason and sought to be defended by proof-texts, historical precedents, philosophical speculations, and similar instruments of controversy. The result was, and is, that the true essential nature of forgiveness has been left obscure by a process which meant only that one kind of scholasticism was substituted for another.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE ELEVENTH ARTICLE

The Resurrection of the body

Σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν

In the *Institution of a Christian Man*, published in 1537, this article runs: "I believe that at domesday all the people of the world that ever was or ever shall be unto that day shall then arise in the self-same flesh and body which they had while they lived on earth." In the Baptismal Creed of the Church of England the article speaks of the "resurrection of the flesh." Martin Luther in his long Catechism says: "In good German we should speak of the resurrection of the body or of the corpse, but this is of no great importance as long as we understand the word rightly."

These more modern authorities carry on faithfully an early tradition, though one that does not rest on the N.T. The N.T. phrase is "resurrection of the dead."[1] For Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian use the phrase. Justin, for example,[2] says that "right-minded Christians on all points are assured that there will be a resurrection of the

[1] Ἀνάστασις [τῶν] νεκρῶν, Matt. xxii. 31, Acts xvii. 32, xxiii. 6, xxiv. 21, xxvi. 23, 1 Cor. xv. 12, Heb. vi. 2, etc.

[2] *Dial.* 80.

dead, and a thousand years in Jerusalem which will then be built, adorned, and enlarged." He had already, however, a little before admitted that many "true Christians" thought otherwise. And in *Apol.* i. 18 he says that "we expect to receive again our own bodies, though they be dead and cast into the earth." Tertullian is still more precise, for, when speaking of the injunction[1] to fear Him who can cast body and soul into Gehenna, he says: "I understand by the *body* of man nothing but this whole mass of flesh which is seen, held and killed by men . . . the flesh, in fact, which as it will be destroyed in hell if it has not feared rather to be destroyed by God, so it will be vivified to life eternal, if it has preferred to be killed by men."[2] But the belief in the resurrection of the flesh was the easier for Tertullian because he believed (with the Stoics) that the soul was also material.[3] Moreover, one of his reasons for maintaining the resurrection of the flesh was that the flesh was the seat of memory, and memory the guarantor of personal identity; was Marcion to be raised, he asks scornfully, in place of Valentinus: "if I do not remember that it was I who acted meritoriously how shall I give glory to God?"[4]

So 2 Clement[5] is insistent that as we were called in the flesh we should come in the flesh to receive our reward: "let no one therefore say that the flesh itself is not judged nor yet raised." And so the *Shepherd of Hermas*[6] says that no one is to allow the thought to come into his heart that the

[1] Matt. x. 28.
[2] *De resur. carnis*, xxxv.
[3] "Anima vero corpus, tamen ipsa est corpus non animatum sed animans potius" (*ibid.* c. 53).
[4] *Ibid.* c. 56.
[5] C. ix., cf. also c. xiv.
[6] *Sim.* v. 7. 2; cf. Ignat. *ad Eph.* 7; *ad Smyr.* 2.

flesh is destructible and so may be stained with impunity.

Where did this belief come from which is couched in terms not native to the N.T., and indeed is in contradiction to doctrines of the Gospels and of St. Paul? Anybody who will be at the pains to read John v. or 1 Cor. xv. and then will pass to Tertullian will feel that he has passed into an alien intellectual atmosphere. What is the disturbing force which has entered and given a new setting to the older order of thoughts?

Some might be tempted to look to Egypt for the answer. There the Osiris and its mummy were not entirely different and distinct, "and the embalmers equipped the mummy as though it were called upon to journey forth as the Osiris. The inherent contradiction in all this arose principally from the fact that the Egyptian hoped and believed that shortly after death he would rise again, complete in flesh and blood as he had lived upon earth, whereas experience contradicted his creed, for it showed him that the mummy never did and never could leave the earth. He extricated himself from the dilemma by providing the mummy with a *Doppelgänger*, its own perfect counterpart, yet not itself. When once we have familiarised ourselves with this singular idea we find in it a simple key to all the riddles of the *Osiris*."[1] Wiedemann points out later[2] that the Egyptian doctrine of souls reincarnating was not the vulgar doctrine of metempsychosis stated by Herodotus,[3] but instead the doctrine that transmigration "was not

[1] Wiedemann, *The Ancient Egyptian Doctrine of Immortality*, 1895, p. 47.

[2] P. 61. [3] ii. 123.

the doom of imperfect souls, but a privilege reserved for such as had already attained perfection," that the blessed soul could assume any form and visit any place at will. He was free of the three worlds. But this power of reincarnating was the reason for embalming the physical body, for the Osiris in its return to earth-form would have a special interest in its old companion, the physical body, and if this were destroyed it would be deprived of one mode of manifestation, and that the most natural to it.

We should perhaps remind ourselves before dismissing Egyptian influences on our Article that in general Egypt believed that man was the sum-total of a series of bodies—the *Ka* or double, the *haibit* or shadow, the *Khu* or ghost, the *ba* or "soul," and others — held together by the *ran* or "Name" which M. Foucart[1] interprets as "Kernels of energy, vibrating, perhaps luminous (of course material), distinct from and incapable of dissolving into one another"; and further, "the *ran*, or 'name,' was something like a bundle of energetic waves, 'rhythmic' waves, with their special characteristics — and particularly numbers which the voice can reproduce if there is 'attunement.'" Though the *sahu* may not, perhaps, be regarded as the Egyptian form of the spiritual body mentioned by St. Paul,[2] yet the Egyptian speculations may easily have gone to form part of the popular conceptions of which the Christian doctrine is a simplified edition.

Unfortunately there is no evidence that the teaching of Irenaeus and Tertullian was derived directly or indirectly from Egypt, and what there is runs in the opposite direction. The natural

[1] *Ency. of Rel. and Ethics*, ii. 764. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 44.

channel for native Egyptian conceptions was through Alexandria, and the Alexandrians were moulded by other agencies—Plato, Aristotle, the Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. They thus regarded matter as evil against spirit as good; they believed in the pre-existence of the soul, and they looked forward to obtaining through a virtuous life "incorporeal and immortal life in the presence of the uncreated and immortal God."[1] All these three doctrines sterilised the Egyptian soil for the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh.

Nor is the case any better with the Stoic, Orphic, or Pythagorean doctrines which filled the Greek world at the beginning of our era. All regarded the body as the tomb of the soul; soul and body differed infinitely in value, for the former was of Divine origin and nature while the latter was mere clay, foul and dead. Aristotle alone insisted on the organic unity of soul and body.[2] In none of these schools was anything taught but what set the scholar on looking for a decisive separation from the body as soon as possible, and made the prospect of a reunion of the body to the soul repugnant. None of them would have had much sympathy with the doctrine of Leibniz that "a disembodied soul would be a deserter from the general order, which implies matter and movement and their laws."

But when we turn to Mazdaism and Jewish Apocalyptic we feel that the doctrine of the resur-

[1] R. H. Charles, *Eschatology*, 1899, p. 253; Philo, *De Gigantibus*, iii.

[2] Cf., for example, Seneca, *Ep.* cii. 22, "Cum venerit dies ille qui mixtum hoc divini humanique secernat, corpus hoc ubi inveni relinquam, ipse me Dis reddam"; and *Ep.* cxx. 14, "Scit enim quo exiturus sit qui unde venerit meminit."

rection of the flesh is on congenial soil. That the former exercised a strong influence on the latter in pre-Christian times is generally admitted. "The extent of the influence of Parseeism upon the beliefs of Israel under the Achemenides cannot be determined, but its existence is undeniable. Some of its doctrines, as for instance those relating to angels and demons, the end of the world and the final resurrection, were propagated everywhere in the basin of the Mediterranean as a consequence of the diffusion of Jewish colonies." [1]

"When the world came to an end the body also was to share in that happiness [of the gods] because it was believed as in Egypt that the whole person would enjoy eternal life. After time had run its course Mithra would raise all men from the dead, pouring out a marvellous beverage of immortality for the good, but all evil-doers would be annihilated by fire together with Ahriman himself." [2] So, too, Bousset in his *Religion des Judentums* [3] has discussed in detail the influence of the Iranian religion on later Judaism, and concluded for a strong infiltration of its ideas, especially on Apocalyptic.

The Jewish apocalyptic belief in the resurrection of the flesh depended on its belief in the visible reign of the Messiah on earth for a limited period. In Enoch [4] the Messiah reigns for two weeks before "the great eternal judgment." In 1 Cor. xv. 23-28 we seem to have an echo of the same thought, which is afterwards expanded by a discussion of the transmutation the body will undergo before it will be ready to enjoy the blessings of the Messianic

[1] Cumont, *Oriental Religions*, p. 138.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 159.
[3] 1903, pp. 455-491.
[4] xci. 12-15.

Kingdom. In Rev. xx. 4 the doctrine becomes explicit. The first resurrection gives the saints a reign with Christ on earth for a thousand years, and the second destroys the wicked, and beatifies the righteous finally. According to 4 Esdras,[1] God's son, Jesus, and His own will live and rejoice for 400 years, and then He and all men will die. In the Slavonic Enoch the writer "reasons that since the earth was created in six days, its history will be accomplished in 6000 years, evidently basing his view on the O.T. words that 'each day with the Lord is as 1000 years'; and as the six days of creation were followed by one of rest, so the 6000 years of the world's history will be followed by a rest of 1000 years."[2] In the Apocalypse of Baruch —a document of Jewish orthodoxy contemporaneous with our Synoptic gospels—are three short apocalypses; the first offers plenteousness of corn and wine when Messiah appears to awaken those who have fallen asleep in hope of Him; in the second, Messiah is a warrior-king who slays Antichrist and then reigns "until the world of corruption is at an end"; in the third, death and sins and disease and sorrow will be done away, and the Messiah will "sit down in peace for the age on the throne of His Kingdom . . . for that time is the consummation of that which is corruptible, and the beginning of that which is incorruptible." In all three is offered a *Zwischenreich* with earthly felicity, and one reason given for the erection of this kingdom is that it is "necessary to show to the living that

[1] vii. 28, *Texts and Studies*, iii., No. 2, p. 27.

[2] Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 261; the 400 years of 4 Esdras were based similarly on the text, "Comfort us again now after the years that thou hast plagued us," viz. the 400 years spent in Egyptian bondage.

the dead have come to life again, and that those who had departed have returned." [1]

Side by side with the Jewish expectations of a temporary kingdom of " that side " set up on " this side," an expectation derived from an older Persian belief, was a belief which emphasised the resurrection (expressed for example in *Ethiopian Enoch*) as effective only at the close of the Messianic kingdom. The Alexandrines placed the resurrection after death (when they did not date it from the moment of regeneration), and the Pharisees looked for a resurrection of the soul or spirit in a body unlike the present, or clothed in the glory of God.

The point, however, which concerns us here is that the doctrine of " the resurrection of the flesh " in our Creed is bound up with none of these latter, but with the apocalyptic belief in chiliasm, which is defined as the " extra-historical planting of the transfigured ' that side ' in the imperfection of this side." [2] " This flesh," referred to in the Creed, was to rise when the Chiliastic kingdom was set up, but when the doctrine of chiliasm degenerated into a heresy the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh lost its base.

It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that chiliasm with its corollary of the resurrection of the flesh should be summarily dismissed as an unhappy aberration of Christian thought. For it helped effectively to save Christianity from becoming a philosophy in place of a religion. " The Hellenic contrast of ' spirit ' and ' flesh ' could not become completely developed in Christianity, because the belief in the bodily resurrection of Christ, and in the admission of the flesh into heaven,

[1] Ch. l. 3. [2] Hauch, *Realency*. iii. 806.

opposed to the principle of dualism a barrier which Paul as yet neither knew nor felt to be necessary. The conviction as to the resurrection of the flesh proved the hard rock which shattered the energetic attempts to give a completely Hellenic complexion to the Christian religion." [1]

Nevertheless, while we may admit that the intrusion of Jewish thought was not an unmixed evil, as we may admit that the substitution of Catholicism for Christianity exemplifies once more Bacon's adage that the mixing of alloy with gold debases the sovereign while making it work the better, yet the benefit was greater still when the alien element was dismissed as having done its work. The doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh had prevented Christianity from being evaporated into a speculation, but it also, unless purified, exposed it to the risk of petrifying the Christian spirit. It became necessary, therefore, to insist that the Christian hope was not dependent on the chiliastic belief, but had a deeper and more enduring base. This was found in a closer analysis of human nature, and in an enlargement of the conception of the "flesh." In this latter point the usage of St. Paul afforded a lead, and in the former the belief in another body (ἕτερον σῶμα) held by the Pharisees.[2] From the point of view of the comparative science of religion we might say that Christian thought was aided in its escape from Persian dualism by the activity of germs of thought introduced from Egypt.

For *flesh* in Hebrew, as in Hellenistic Greek, like most words, was used in a wider as in a narrower meaning. Chiliasm accentuated the narrower, but

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. 331. [2] Josephus, *B. J.* ii. 8. 14.

in more cultured circles *flesh* was the name of the whole man as a phenomenal being. Philosophy is in the habit of setting in antithesis flesh and spirit, or body and mind, but to Religion the opposition is between man as a creature and God as creator, or between man as forgetting God and man as "in God." In the former sense he is called *flesh.* Again the whole man is sometimes described under the formula of flesh and heart, or flesh and spirit, where the two elements are not so much opposed as distinguished in their union. Hence in this sense the resurrection of the flesh means that the lower part of man's composite nature shares in the final glorification of the whole.

It is obvious that the acceptance of this position is fatal to that Puritanism which has for so many centuries been at once a septic and a corrosive in the Church. For historic Catholicism, from the days of Montanus and Novatian to Luther and the "Nonconformist conscience," has instinctively set itself against a one-sided spiritualism. Its moral code, indeed, has been open to the charge of laxity, and its attitude to the world has been so friendly as to seem ambiguous. Yet, as "no people do so much harm as those who go about doing good," so it was the feeling of this that led the authorities of the Church to discourage all violent anticipation of the judgment day. Certainly they may have at the same time shown themselves too complacent to the existing order, but on the other hand it is doubtful which has done most harm, the worldly wisdom of the Church which shrank from challenging the world, or the undisciplined zeal of Puritanism which could never see the good mingled with the evil it attacked.

The doctrine of the resurrection of the *body* is the Church's answer to all Puritans who disparage the material just because it is not spiritual. And its implication is that just as the spiritual has its root in the being of God, so too has the material. It matters little whether you call the process by which the material as well as the spiritual came out from God creation or emanation—the difference is verbal only—for in both cases the idea expressed is the same, that God is one and beside Him there is nothing else. Matter is eternal in the same sense that spirit is eternal, though properly speaking God alone is eternal, and matter and spirit are necessary aeonian manifestations of His eternal Nature. But given this aeonian condition no good ground is offered for disparaging matter in order to exalt spirit. They are partners for life and may not be put asunder without loss, even though their partnership involve inequality. "The true source of the life of science is to be found . . . in showing how *absolutely universal is the extent* and at the same time how *completely subordinate the significance of the mission which mechanism has to fulfil in the structure of the world.*" [1] Mechanism covers indeed more than what we are accustomed ordinarily to call *matter*—thought, for example, is bound by logic, and the will by motives, and both logic and the impulses which form the raw material of motives obey the mechanism of Causality—but at all events it covers matter. Spirit, indeed, is free and self-determining, but the instant it acts, that is, the instant on which it emerges from its home it ceases to be pure spirit and becomes a mixed thing to which the name of Soul is given. The soul in this

[1] Lotze, *Microcosmus*, i. 16 (the italics are not mine).

sense is the complex of the impulses which animate the organism, and, strictly speaking, has no substantial existence apart from these.

The fact of the temporal and transitional character of the soul must be made clear if we are to be free to collocate the two factors of spirit and body which are the sole determinants of our problem. The difficulty in treating of the soul arises from the ambiguity of its term. The word occurs but seldom in modern authorities on psychology, *Mind* taking its place. Popularly it connotes the emotional as distinguished from the rational part of our immaterial self. In Clement of Alexandria it stands for the inner man in his tripartite being, whether of desire, "irascibility," and thought,[1] or of perception, understanding, and reason.[2] We have here an echo of Plato, who laid down that passion [3] is not a kind of reason, but a third principle with the rational and the concupiscent.[4] Otherwise he speaks of God putting intelligence in soul and soul in body.[5] Similarly Aristotle, while defining the soul as "the simplest actuality [6] of a physical body which possesses life potentially (such a body, however, is what we call 'organic'),"[7] yet says there may be something in the soul which may be separable from the body, not being an actuality of it at all, in much the same way that a sailor may be in a boat without being an "actuality" of it. The sailor in the boat is Reason, active Reason when he is thought of as independent

[1] Ἐπιθυμία, θυμός, and λογισμός.

[2] Αἴσθησις, λόγος, νοῦς ; *Strom.* ii. 11. 50, and iii. 10. 68 ; Bigg, *Christian Platonists*, p. 107.

[3] Θυμός. [4] *Repub.* iv. 441. [5] *Tim.* 30.

[6] Ἐντελέχεια = complete existence as opposed to potentiality.

[7] *De anima*, ii. 1. 6.

of the boat,[1] passive Reason [2] when he submits to the limitations of life in the boat. In the language of Christian philosophy we should speak of the former as Spirit and the latter as Soul. The latter alone is known immediately in experience; the former is mediated by reflection.[3]

This doctrine of Aristotle's about the Soul forms the base of the scholastic doctrine which remained unchallenged seriously until the days of Descartes. Indeed, long after his day the simplicity and substantiality of the soul have been defended by the philosophy of dualism or of common sense, and in special by the "Scotch School." With the Schoolmen it is maintained that there exists a valid distinction between substance and accidents that "in the case of thoughts, volitions, and emotions we have manifest instances of what we mean by real accidents: for these even by Divine power could not exist at all unless they had a subject of inhesion." [4] The distinction, however, of substance and accidents is not the critical distinction here. The critical distinction is between substance as "that which exists by itself and does not inhere in another," while accident is that which inheres in another.[5] And the scholastic contention is that

[1] Νοῦς ποιητικός. [2] Νοῦς παθητικός.

[3] "This Reason it is by which all things become, in the way that light causes colours that are merely potential to be actual colours. And this Active Reason may exist independent of the body, unmingled with matter and unaffected by it. . . . As independent it alone truly is what it is, and it alone is deathless and eternal; but as it is unimpressionable we do not remember through it. The receptive mind, on the other hand, is corruptible, and without it there is no thought" (*De anima*, iii. 5. 2; Sir A. Grant, *The Ethics of Aristotle*, i. 298).

[4] Rickaby, *General Metaphysics*, p. 247; cf. St. Thomas Aq.: "Substantia est ens tanquam per se habens esse: accidens vero tanquam cuius esse est inesse" (*De potentia*, A. vii.).

[5] In scholastic language, substance is *id quod est*, while accident is *id quo est*, substance is what is, accident what modifies substance; the one

the Soul is such a substance that it exists *per se*, though not indeed *a se*. The Soul, it is urged, is the unknown, simple, substantial essence of which all thoughts, volitions, and emotions are modifications. Rickaby quotes Henry of Ghent as saying : " The substance of the soul, which is really one thing, nevertheless according to its different determinations is said to have different faculties of intellect and sense ; but radically its faculties are nothing but its simple substance, the diversity of powers adding nothing over and above its essence, except a reference to the diversity of its activities according as their objects vary." [1]

On the other hand modern Psychologists, like the late William James, are disposed to convert the proposition, " the soul is its faculties," into the proposition, " the faculties are the soul." [2] The two parties are at bottom emphasising two inseparable sides of a duality. Just as in every example of Causality we have change in a thing which yet paradoxically remains the same, so in every activity of the Soul (so-called) we have a modification of something which has a relative permanency. James says that all we observe is " a stream of thoughts, each substantially different from the rest, but cognitive of the rest and ' appropriative ' of each other's content " ; we have, therefore, " no need of reference to any more simple or substantial

---

is an *ens*, the other an *ens entis*. So St. Thomas : " Substantiae nomen . . . significat essentiam cui competit sic esse, id est, per se esse ; quod tamen non est ipsa eius essentia " (*Summa*, 1a. iii. 5 ; cf. 1a. xxix. 2).

[1] *Summa*, p. 255.

[2] Cf. what Rickaby, *ubi supra*, ascribes to Duns Scotus : " The substance of the soul is really identical with its faculties," and his approval (p. 261) of Rosmini's statement that " there can be no modification without a subject modified." The line of opposition between Rickaby and James wears very thin as it goes along.

agent than the present 'Thought,' or section of the stream." [1] But why "substantially different?" This is to introduce a plurality of substances where one is sufficient, to confuse where else there is union. And as Professor James rejects Hume's associationism by which those distinct substances he called perceptions are bound together, it is for him to show that his theory of pulses of thought simply corresponding to brain processes is a better hypothesis than that of a Soul (to use his own words) out of which the brain-processes knock the thought. That something within us is modified by stimuli from without is a fact of observation. That that something is relatively permanent is a necessary Truth in the sense that if it be not true our intellectual life possesses no order, or unity, and forms no system. Professor James, however, it must be borne in mind was speaking as a psychologist only; and eschewing metaphysics without denying its validity. When he became metaphysical he said that he found the notion of some sort of an *anima mundi* thinking in all of us to be a more promising hypothesis than that of a lot of absolutely individual souls. And there for the present we may be content to leave him.

We may, however, pursue our quest for the nature of the Soul by trying to ascertain the meaning of an allied term the Self. And perhaps we shall find that as the Soul is an accident and not a substance, an attribute, that is, of Spirit when it is more living and of Body when it is less living, so we may find that the Self at its lowest is identical with our Body and at its highest with our Spirit. In neither case would it possess substantial existence.

[1] *Principles of Psychology*, i. 344.

Sully[1] traces the various steps of the development of the idea of Self. Self stands (*a*) for consciousness of body; then (*b*) for consciousness of mental self as distinct from body—a consciousness formed by conation and imagination; then (*c*) for a consciousness determined by ideation and helped in its formation by language, as *e.g.* by the use of *thou*; he quotes Goethe as saying that "the name is not worn as a dress, but grows on to us layer upon layer, like our skin"; next (*d*) is the consciousness of Self as enduring, or the sense of Personal Identity; this is largely dependent on the body with its relatively fixed mass of organic sensation;[2] also "our idea of Self is largely a reflection of others' perception of us,"[3] and is partly based on retention and reproduction. But "the idea of a personal identity . . . is largely a construction, in which the fundamental idea of Self, viz. of the body, with its concomitant complex of organic sensations which only slowly changes, is a chief contributing element." Again, "the complexity of our mental life . . . seems to lend itself to the scheme of a duality of selves, a lower impulsive, and a higher contemplative Ego ('*moi spectateur*'), which are somehow conjoined with a single body." Lastly, we have "the attainment of a consciousness of a personality, that is, an individual character with certain (relatively permanent)

[1] *The Human Mind*, i. 479 ff.

[2] Cf. Aristotle's dictum that "Reason may be looked on as dependent on conceptions derived from the senses" (μὴ ἄνευ φαντασίας).

[3] So Caldwell, *Pragmatism and Idealism*, 1913, p. 161: "As for the adult his 'ego' or self has a meaning and a reality only in relation to, and in comparison with the other selves of whom we think as his associates." And in a footnote he points out, after Payne, that we have reason for believing that the collective *we* precedes *I* in the order of linguistic evolution. "I for one" is prior to "I by myself."

intellectual and moral attributes." And, finally, to make Sully's doctrine complete we are told [1] that "the stimulus of the feeling of Self is the presentation of some aspect, feature, or concomitant of the Ego or Self, recognised as such, that is to say, as a part of 'me,' or as 'mine,' which has a distinctly agreeable or disagreeable character." [2]

With this agrees Professor Baldwin, who says that "it is the organisation of the inner control factors, those of affection and conation and interest, that becomes the subject-self; and the meanings determined by these as interests of the Self are the fulfilments of its cravings, its values or worth." [3] And again: "The only thing purely psychic is that in which body claims inner meaning, and also that wherein mind has inner presence. . . . 'Let this then,' says the Dame (Nature), 'be finally the inner, the Self of selves, the 'I' in the nominative case and with a capital letter; and let all the rest, body, mind, mixed mass as it is, persisting in its confusions and illegitimate acts of commerce, let it all be mere object in that whole of experience whose subject the 'I' is.'" [4]

James Ward denies that the self that loves (referring to Bishop Butler's self-love) is absolutely identical with the self that knows, for "out of barren identities nothing can come. The self that I love, that is, the self that I know, is *my* self holding intercourse, having reciprocal relations, with a community of *other* selves and with an environment to an indefinite extent resolvable into

[1] *The Human Mind*, ii. 97.

[2] Similarly, Professor James divides the constituents of the Self into the material Self, the social Self, the spiritual Self, and the pure Ego (*Principles of Psychology*, i. 292-370).

[3] *Thoughts and Things*, i. 135. [4] *Ibid.* i. 259.

selves." [1] But this implies that the Self that knows is the Thinker, the object of whose thought is the other self that is made objective by social or intersubjective intercourse.

And a more recent essayist [2] says: "Even if, on an analysis of experience similar to Kant's it should turn out that all experience involves a conscious centre by which it is experienced, it is quite unscientific to identify at once this centre with the historical individual, whom the biographer and the historian commemorate, who is limited to a particular corner of space, and whose days are only threescore years and ten." [3]

So too Lotze [4] finds self-consciousness rooted (as James finds it rooted) in the feelings of pleasure and pain, that is, in the warmth or intimacy which accompany the thought of our "me" as against that of our neighbour. "Not as thought, but as felt in its immediate value for us does the identity of the thinker and the thought form the foundation of our self-consciousness, and once for all lift the distinction between us and the world beyond all comparison with the differences by which it discriminates between one object and another."

Mr. Bradley, while maintaining that "no element of Reality falls outside the experience of finite centres," also points out that "a centre of experience is not the same thing as a soul, or, again, a

[1] *Realm of Ends*, 1912, p. 343.

[2] W. H. Moberly in *Foundations*, p. 458.

[3] Cf. Aristotle, *Nic. Ethics*, ix. 4. 4: "The thinking faculty would appear to be each man's proper Self, or more so than anything else." This νοεῖν is the synthesis of the active and passive reason, and was afterwards the basis of the Monopsychism taught by Averroes, according to which the Active Reason is one and undivided in all men, and gains individuality through bodily sensation alone.

[4] *Microcosmus*, i. 250.

self. It need not contain the distinction of not-self from self . . . and a soul is always the creature of an intellectual abstraction." [1] He defines the soul as "a finite centre of immediate experience, possessed of a certain temporal continuity of existence, and again of a certain identity in character." [2] And what he means by calling the soul an ideal construction is that in so far as it is more than what is given in experience, so far, that is, as "it is considered to continue in time and to maintain a certain sameness," [3] it transcends what is given. From a certain fact, say a meadow, is cut loose one of its features, say its greenness. The idea of this greenness so detached from fact is then applied to another fact, say an emerald, and so we pass to the judgment, this emerald is green. Similarly, we take a present experience, a mass of actual feeling, and enlarge it by referring other past experiences to it, so as to make a unity of past and present, and when we have so idealised the present experience we have "constructed" a thing to which we give the name of Soul. But, Mr. Bradley contends, this is an appearance and not reality, a moment in the Absolute but not itself Being. "In brief, because the existence of the soul is not experienced and not given, because it is made by, and consists in, transcendence of the 'present,' and because its content is obviously never one with its being, its 'what' is always in flagrant discrepancy with its 'that'—therefore its whole position is throughout inconsistent and untenable. It is an arrangement natural and necessary, but for all that phenomenal and illusive,

[1] *Appearance and Reality*, p. 529. [2] *Ibid.* p. 298.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 302.

a makeshift, valuable, but still not genuine reality. And, looked at by itself, the soul is an abstraction and mutilation. It is the arbitrary use of material for a particular purpose. And it persists only by refusing to see more in itself than subserves its own existence." [1]

Bergson's contribution to our enquiry is of rather a different kind. He sees in intuition, not in analysis, the faculty which reveals the nature of the Ego. "What is really important for philosophy is to know exactly what unity, what multiplicity, and what reality superior both to abstract unity and multiplicity, the multiple unity of the self actually is. Now philosophy will only know this when it recovers possession of the simple intuition of the self by the self. Then, according to the direction it chooses for its descent from this summit, it will arrive at unity or multiplicity, or at any of the concepts by which we try to define the moving life of the self." [2]

Professor James Ward appears to oppose any attempt to identify the Self with its states. Without a person, he says, no property. "Experience is in this sense property: it is always owned. Percepts and appetites that nobody has are not percepts and appetites at all. . . . If there is only a bundle of percepts and motives, but no self to determine or control, it is obvious that there can be no self to be determined or controlled." [3] But valid as this criticism is against Associationism it

[1] *Appearance and Reality*, p. 304. Of course in Mr. Bradley's metaphysic body and spirit are also "appearances" and "ideal constructions" (pp. 306 and 498), but he is quoted here as an authority for the view that the soul, even when compared with these two other constructions, is but a makeshift.

[2] *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, Eng. trans. 1913, p. 33.

[3] *The Realm of Ends*, pp. 290-291.

does not affect our present contention that the "Empirical Ego" of common sense is an illusion, a reflection from the "Pure Ego" of the higher sphere, which again is reflected in its turn from the "Transcendental Ego" of the eternal order.

It would be tedious, perhaps, to labour the point that philosophy (which is but ordinary thought purged of looseness and obscurity) is clear that the soul is no more than the name we give to our existing Self in its state of being a compound or union of spirit and body—a state which is never constant in anybody, but fluctuating as now spirit controls body or now body limits spirit. It will be more congenial to many readers to turn to what religion has to say about the soul.

Buddhism stands alone in India in rejecting the doctrine that souls exist. It is the union of mental qualities alone which make the individual. All things come, all things go, for all things, including the suppositious soul, are compounds; they *become*, they change, they dissolve, they pass away. In the *Dialogues of the Buddha*,[1] the Exalted One rejects all three theories of the soul: that of its being a material soul, built up of the four elements; that of its being an exact copy of the body and material, but so subtle that it can be described as made of mind; and the third, that of being without form and made of consciousness, because man attains to one state of consciousness after another, and finds no permanence anywhere.

The *Theologia Germanica* is insistent on the truth that all sin is self-will, the claiming to be somewhat, the turning from the unchangeable

[1] Translated by Rhys Davids, 1899, p. 252.

Good to the changeable, and that blessedness lieth not in much and many, but in One and oneness. A man, therefore, should if enlightened enough say: "I would fain be to the Eternal Goodness what His own hand is to a man." "What is there," cries the anonymous author, "which is, and which we may account for somewhat? I answer, 'Nothing but that which we may call God.'"

"I behold," says St. Augustine, "how some things pass away that others may replace them, but Thou dost never depart, O God, my Father supremely good, Beauty of all things beautiful." [1] So the incisive meaning of the text which effected his conversion—"put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ"—was derived from the fact that it bade him substitute the Christ-consciousness for self-consciousness.[2] Similarly, when Augustine heard God's word saying to him: "I am the food of adults; grow and thou shalt eat Me; nor shall thou change Me into thyself as thou changest carnal food, but thou shalt be changed into Me," [3] we have an implicit reference to the impermanence of the soul. "Deus autem tuus etiam tibi vitae vita est." [4] In short, the *Confessions* of St. Augustine as a whole spring from one suppressed premiss, that the Soul or Self of ordinary consciousness is a temporary illusion, permitted because a necessity in man's spiritual development, but with no substantial existence, serving only to link together the two eternal constituents of man, spirit and body. As Christ is the Mediator between God and Man, being at once God and Man, so the soul is the mediator

[1] Bk. xi. of the *Confessions* is devoted to this question.
[2] *Ibid.* viii. 12. [3] *Ibid.* vii. 10. [4] *Ibid.* x. 6.

between spirit and body, partaking of the nature of both. And as Christ at the end will give up the Kingdom to the Father so will the soul give up its treasures to the spirit. The distinction made by Aristotle between the Active Reason and the Passive Reason, which are yet but two aspects of the one Reason, reappears again here.

But Christian thought can appeal for its doctrine of the illusory character of the soul to the N.T. itself. There we are bidden not to save but to lose our soul.[1] The aphorism turns on a double sense of soul and of losing or finding. The soul is the bearer of the bodily life and also of the spiritual life. If a man by refusing martyrdom preserves his soul on its physical side he loses it on its spiritual and *vice versa*. The range of the aphorism, however, goes beyond martyrdom. It governs Christian life as well as Christian death. He who keeps his soul as his own loses it on its higher side, for he loses Christ. The "for my sake" is critical. "Tota causa ibi est."[2]

The same practical objective must be given to the denying of self in Matt. xvi. 24. It is true that the immediate reference in the actual setting of the verse is to physical death, but it is also true that this reference does not exhaust the meaning of the saying, and it is by no means a hazardous assertion that the physical is not the primary reference. The denial is in any case rejection, not of something which is an attribute of the self, but of the Self

[1] Matt. x. 39.

[2] Cf. St. Augustine, *De doctr. Christ.* iii. 24: "When the Lord says, 'He who loves his soul shall lose it,' He is not to be thought as forbidding that use of it which consists in self-preservation, but as forbidding that perverse and preposterous use by which it busies itself with temporal things and does not seek eternal."

itself. The empirical Ego must give way to the pure Ego, the Self to the Christ.

Similarly St. Paul could say, "I have been crucified with Christ; but it is not I that liveth any more, but he that liveth in me is Christ."[1] This sparkling verse is at once a comment on taking up the Cross and on the meaning of Conversion. The being crucified with Christ plainly means the undergoing the mystical crucifixion which Jesus underwent, not a symbolic or similar crucifixion, but the same *real* and therefore mystical crucifixion. This defines Crucifixion as a spiritual fact as consisting in the surrender of Self and its consciousness to the inner and eternal Christ and His consciousness. And this change took place when Saul saw the heavenly Christ, and when his body and soul ceased to be his own, and were taken possession of by Another, who henceforth acted in and through Paul.

We arrive at the same result from another class of passages where the Christian is described as a new creature[2] and his life as new wine,[3] his message as a new tongue,[4] his law a new commandment,[5] his nature a new lump;[6] he himself is a new man,[7] bearing a new name,[8] and a member of a new city, the new Jerusalem.[9] This newness is celebrated by the Psalmists as calling for a new song,[10] and the underlying idea throughout is that of the spiritual life transforming so radically the old Adam that the product can be described by no less thoroughgoing an epithet than new. But that which best

[1] Gal. ii. 20. [2] 2 Cor. v. 17. [3] Mark ii. 22.
[4] Mark xvi. 17. [5] John xiii. 34. [6] 1 Cor. v. 7.
[7] Ephes. ii. 15, iv. 24, Col. iii. 10. [8] Rev. ii. 17.
[9] Rev. xxi. 2.
[10] xxxiii. 3, xl. 3, xcvi. 1, xcviii. 1, cxliv. 9, cxlix. 1.

fulfils this requirement is a new consciousness depending on a new centre and giving a new relationship to all persons and things.[1]

[1] "The lamp contains its oil, which it holds securely in its close grasp and guards from the least loss. Thus is it separate from all other objects around it and is miserly. But when lighted it finds its meaning at once; its relation with all things far and near is established, and it freely sacrifices its fund of oil to feed the flame" (Rabindranath Tagore, *Sadhana*, p. 76). Just before Mr. Tagore speaks of the lower and the higher aspects of the Self as being seen in self-display and self-revelation.

CHAPTER XXV

THE ELEVENTH ARTICLE (*continued*)

The Resurrection of the body (*continued*)

THIS somewhat tedious enquiry into the meaning of the *soul* has for its object the removal of an intruder whose presence seems to disturb the harmony of the two partners of spirit and body. It is not intended to throw doubt on the existence of a continuous self which is implied in all knowledge. Nor is it meant to blur the distinction between the individual self and the Universal Self-consciousness by any one-sided assertion of the kinship of nature between the two. All that is contended for is that Soul as antithetical to Spirit is an unnecessary figment, and at best only a convenient *tertium quid*, which may be useful to thought in its attempts to find a meeting-ground for Spirit and Body. That it is an eternal third to the eternal pair of Spirit and Body both scientific psychology and religious thought seem agreed in denying. We must find, therefore, in individuated Spirit the ground of the relatively permanent Self, and in all probability regard Body as the principle of the individuation, that which, according to Greek thought, formed a cosmos out of the chaos of the infinite and undetermined.

Strictly speaking, therefore, we cannot say that the Church believes in the immortality of the Soul, unless we mean by Soul, as indeed people often do, the individuated Spirit. And some would hardly go as far as this, but would content themselves on this head with asserting an immortality for such Spirits alone which had attained a certain level of worthy life. "The hypothesis of Immortality for all souls whose actual or potential capacity reaches a certain level of value is the one which most completely rationalizes the Universe." Hence, "it is perhaps too dogmatic to assert that every individual will attain Immortality even among human souls." [1] So Lotze: "We have no other principle for deciding it [Immortality] than this general idealistic belief: that every created thing will continue whose continuance belongs to the meaning of the world, and so long as it does so belong; while every one will pass away whose reality is justified only in a transitory phase of the world's course. That this principle admits of no further application in human hands need hardly be said. *We* surely know not the merits which may give to one being a claim on Eternity, nor the defects which would cut others off." [2] This is not necessarily in contradiction of what Lotze says elsewhere,[3] that "one can never imagine that anything which has once existed can cease to be," for Lotze would probably retort that that which had ceased to be had never really been at all. James [4] says similarly that "we believe ourselves immortal because we believe ourselves *fit* for immortality.

[1] Rashdall, *The Theory of Good and Evil*, ii. 352-353.
[2] *Metaphysik*, p. 245.
[3] *Microcosmus*, ii. 111.
[4] *Principles of Psychology*, i. 348.

A ' substance ' ought surely to perish, we think, if not worthy to survive." What Benedetto Croce says of the moral man, that he " atrophies certain organs and suppresses certain vital functions for universal ends," may be applied *mutatis mutandis* to God's dealings with His creatures.[1] And once more James Ward puts himself on the " side of the angels " : " The ideal is there and is to be realised : it is rational to believe this, and all that it implies, if it is rational to believe anything. One thing that it implies in an evolving world like ours is a gradual advance from the *status quo* of humanity, whereon the ideal has dawned, ever forwards into the perfect day. Humanity already has yearnings and aspirations that the flesh-pots of Egypt—material and temporal well-being—can never content ; is it, impelled by these longings for higher things, destined to wander aimlessly in the wilderness forever unsatisfied ? " [2] In this they would be substantially in agreement with the Dionysiac devotees who found their immortality in the partaking of the life of the gods through the efficacy of orgiastic rites.[3] But whether we regard the " proof " of " immortality " to be drawn from the nature of the " soul " as a simple substance, or rest it on a " judgment of value " that that necessarily persists

[1] *Philosophy of the Practical*, 1913, p. 432.

[2] *The Realm of Ends*, 1912, p. 425.

[3] Rohde, *Psyche*, 1894, p. 324, says : " The feeling of their divinity, their eternity which had suddenly revealed itself to them in ecstasy forced the soul to the abiding conviction that it was of divine nature, called to the life of the gods as soon as it quitted the body, the passing experience here being an earnest of what was there unending." So Professor Gordon, *The Poetry of the Old Testament*, pp. 183-184 : " The glad hope of immortality rests, not on speculative arguments from the nature of the soul, but on the sure ground of religious experience. Immortality is, in fact, a necessary implicate of personal religion. The man that lives with God is immortal as He is."

which is fit to persist, or even leave it a more or less probable hypothesis,[1] yet in any case it is the Self as Spirit that we are speaking of, and not the shadowy double which in ordinary language (and often in learned language also) we call the Soul.[2]

It seemed necessary to first clear the "Soul" out of our way if we were to form any clear conception of what should be meant by the "Resurrection of the Body." And we are now in a position to say that in the first place it means that the man is not truly or completely man unless and until (*a*) he has at his service a body of some sort, and (*b*) is at least able to make use of a physical body at will. Both these conceptions go back to pagan times, and both have established themselves in Christian thought.

A. A familiar passage of St. Paul's speaks of different kinds of bodies: "If there is a psychical body there is also a spiritual," [3] where the *if* does not express doubt but the logical ground for a consequence, as in Col. iii. 1, "If ye were raised with Christ," which is "since ye were raised." For in v. 46, he states their relation in time and so assumes their actuality: "the spiritual, however, was not prior, but the psychical"; and in v. 44, he also states as a fact that "the body which is sown is psychical, that which is raised is spiritual."

[1] As Mr. Bradley does, *Appearance and Reality*, p. 510: "A personal continuance is possible, and it is but little more."

[2] Yet it is difficult to evade the force of Lotze's striking affirmation: "However much people may attempt to persuade themselves that the self-conscious Ego is in fact only an event, a vanishing passage between atoms variously moved, still the immediate consciousness of our personal reality will always remain invincible to these attempts, and we can never think of ourselves as melting away in the great receptacle of universal Nature without thinking too that we shall still be preserved, and go on existing in it in our dissolved condition" (*Microcosmus*, ii. 111).

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 44.

Similarly, the psychical man is declared inferior in capacity to the spiritual man in 1 Cor. ii. 14. And James iii. 17 describes the wisdom which cometh not down from above as psychical, while Jude 19 defines certain sophists as psychical, not having spirit. The passage, however, in 1 Cor. xv. is the only passage where it is affirmed that there are two distinct bodies, one fitted to the ψυχή, and the other to the πνεῦμα, or as some might prefer to say, one body changed in order to be fit for a new and higher "form." Where did St. Paul derive this idea from?

Recollecting that when Christianity arose Gnosticism was already rife we shall first enquire what this Protean system (or a-system) of thought had to say about the psyche and its body. Clement of Alexandria, in his *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, describes the Valentinian gnosis as teaching a threefold division of bodies symbolised by Cain, Abel, and Seth. The first is void of reason, the second possessed (or capable) of reason and righteousness, the third is spiritual, and they may be termed hylic, psychic, spiritual. "Many are the hylic, not many the psychical, but few are the spiritual. The spiritual race is by nature saved, but the psychical being free have an aptitude for faith and incorruption, or, according as they choose, for unbelief and destruction. The hylic race, however, is by its very nature lost." [1] Following the Stoics the author declares that the soul is a body.[2] But body

[1] *Excerp.* lvi. 3.

[2] "Not only does it follow, as a corollary from the materialistic view of the world, that the soul must be in its nature corporeal, but the Stoics took pains to uphold this view by special arguments. Whatever, they said, influences the body, and is by it influenced in turn, whatever is united with the body, and again separated from it, must be corporeal. How,

is not what it seems, for "it is woven out of the invisible psychical essence, arriving at the sensible world by virtue of Divine providence."[1] Corresponding with the threefold division of hylic, psychical, and spiritual, Theodotus says that "the Saviour taught the apostles the elements typically and mystically, the later things parabolically and enigmatically, but the third class of things plainly and nakedly in private."[2]

But it was not alone in what we might call orthodox Gnosticism that there was held a doctrine of other bodies beside the physical. In the Jewish world we find it, *e.g.* in the Slavonic Enoch. "The risen righteous are conceived as possessing a heavenly body: for they are clothed with the garments of God's glory. Thus when Enoch was translated, Michael is directed by God to remove Enoch's earthly body, and to give him a body composed of the Divine glory:[3] 'And the Lord said to Michael:

---

then, can the soul be other than corporeal?" (Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, 1870, p. 198). So Tertullian, *De anima*, c. v.: "The soul is a body, and unless it were bodily it would not leave the body." But he expressly bases himself on Zeno and Cleanthes and Chrysippus.

[1] *Excerp.* 59; Bergson, in contrasting ancient thought with modern, says of the former that it melted the conceptions of its science into one. "Neither was the body then defined by geometrical expression, nor the soul by consciousness. If the ψυχή of Aristotle, the entelechy of a living body is less spiritual than our 'Soul,' it is because his σῶμα, already impregnated with the Idea, is less corporeal than our 'body'" (*Creative Evolution*, p. 369).

[2] *Ibid.* 66; Dr. Bigg, *Christian Platonists*, p. 61, sees here "a barbaric Platonism, mingled with Mazdeism, coloured by the influence of the Ebionites and strangely refracted echoes of St. Paul." It would be better to say that all alike are fragments of the syncretistic thought of Hellenism, which in the two centuries before and the two after the opening of the Christian era ruled the Mediterranean basin. The same threefold division is given by Irenaeus as taught by the disciples of Ptolemaeus, whose school might be described as an off-shoot from that of Valentinus, *Adv. Haer.* i. 5. 1, i. 5. 5, i. 7. 5, i. 8. 3, and by Hipp. *Refut.* v. 1.

[3] xxii. 8-10.

Go and take from Enoch his earthly robe, and anoint him with My holy oil; and clothe him with the raiment of my glory.'"[1] Josephus says that the Pharisees believed in a resurrection of the soul clothed in a body unlike the present.[2]

In the Apocalypse of Baruch we have a middle doctrine. The question is asked explicitly as by St. Paul: "In what shape will those live who live in Thy day?" and God replies: "The earth will then assuredly restore the dead, which it now receives, making no change in their form . . . for it will be necessary to show the living that the dead have come to life again." When in this way the righteous dead have been identified their bodies will be transformed, "their splendour will be glorified in changes." It will be the same body but transfigured.[3]

It is not clear whether the doctrine of the Pharisees described by Josephus in the passage just referred to teaches that the soul passes into a different, and presumably more glorious body in the world beyond this, or into another earthly body. The sentence in Josephus affirms "that every soul is imperishable, but that only those of the righteous pass into another body, while those of the wicked are, on the contrary, punished with eternal torment." Here the antithesis seems to make it certain that the body is a higher and better body, as a condition

[1] Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 266.

[2] Ἕτερον σῶμα, *De bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14.

[3] xlix. 2, 3; l. and li.; Schürer, *Jewish People*, Eng. trans. ii. 2. 180; Charles, *Eschatology*, 280-281. So, too, the *Ethiopian Enoch* (lxii. 15, 16) expressly says that when the Son of Man appears the righteous will be clothed with garments of glory, garments of life which will not grow old. This does not mean that a new, different body or body of a higher order will be substituted for the earthly body, or grow out of it and then leave it, but that it is the same body stripped of its infirmities.

of bliss because it is opposed to the torment of the wicked, which it could hardly be if the soul were thought of as reincarnating in an earthly body. But in another passage [1] the Pharisees are made to hold that eternal imprisonment is appointed for the vile, but the possibility of returning to life for the virtuous. Schürer thinks that this passage is against the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, an unintelligible interpretation if by transmigration is meant reincarnation.[2] But he insists that this Pharisaic doctrine was not the mere opinion of a philosophical school with respect to immortality, but that upon which depends the direct religious interest of the personal salvation of each individual. For this appears to be guaranteed only on the assumption of a resurrection of the body.[3]

The Alexandrine school, on the other hand, tended, in consequence of its acceptance of the Oriental view of the nature of matter, to deny any resurrection of the body. It accepted the Orphic formula σῶμα σῆμα,[4] and held that when the soul had done with the body it laid it down and returned to its own proper region.[5] This, however, it is to be noticed, has never found any place in Christian thought, which has been content to symbolise here with St. Paul. Clement Al. is quite clear that the resurrection body is not "this flesh" as the Chiliasts thought of it, but this flesh purified by fire and glorified, as wheat is made into bread by fire, and as Christ Himself rose through fire.[6]

[1] *Ant.* xviii. 1. 3. [2] *Ibid.* ii. 2. 13. [3] *Ibid.* loc. cit.

[4] "Some say that the body is the grave (σῆμα) of the soul which may be thought to be buried in our present life . . . probably the Orphic poets were the inventors of the name" (Plato, *Cratylus*, 400).

[5] *Wisd.* viii. 19, 20; Philo, *De migr. Abrah.* ii. 437.

[6] *Paed.* i. 4. 10; 6. 46.

Irenaeus builds his argument for the resurrection body being this flesh, with the attribute of incorruption added, on the three resurrection miracles in the Gospels, and on 1 Cor. xv. 53, and Phil. iii. 21. The " body of our humiliation " is that which is " humiliated by being laid in the earth. It is transfigured when from being mortal and corruptible it becomes immortal and incorruptible, not of its own substance, but on account of the power of the Lord who is able to add to what is mortal immortality, and incorruption to what is corruptible." [1] This view directed against Valentinians is compatible with the Chiliasm held by Irenaeus, and with that it stands or falls.[2]

With Origen, the first great constructive Christian thinker, we pass into a different atmosphere in which Holy Scripture and Reason both receive reverent treatment. He held with Scripture that the resurrection body is the same body as was worn on earth, and with Reason that it is different. The connecting link between the two is the " germinative principle." This it is which weaves the body which belongs to this aeon, and also the body which will be ours in the next aeon. This doctrine, though substantially that of St. Paul, yet seems to go one step further forward in its analysis. According to 1 Cor. xv. a living principle is " sown " in a mortal frame when a man is born into this world, and the power which gives that body is God. The same continuous living principle is " raised " and again it is God which gives the body as it pleases Him. The analogy quoted to make this process more intelligible is that of the grain sown in the earth,

[1] *Adv. Haer.* v. 13. 3 ; Harvey, ii. p. 357.
[2] Irenaeus states his Chiliastic views in v. 33 and 34.

decaying and rising again in a fairer form. Analogy, however, is not, and is not used here as proof.

Implicit in the teaching alike of St. Paul and of Origen is the postulate of the union in our personality of a relatively permanent "Self," and a fleeting body. The former belongs essentially to the world of Being, and the latter to the world of Becoming. Hence the fact that our present bodies have no permanence in themselves from moment to moment —any more than a river has—makes it evident that the same argument which denies to the resurrection-body continuity with the earthly body is equally valid against the continuity of this earthly body from one moment to another. That is to say, it is in the immortal part of us where the ground of continuity lies both now and then, and hence all that the doctrine of the resurrection of the body implies necessarily is that the fact that as man requires *a* body now to complete his personality, so will he require *a* body then and for the same reason. Our present body is made up of atoms of matter; the future may be constructed of light, or of aether, or of some "imponderable," or may not be compounded at all. All that seems necessary to the Christian doctrine is the conclusion that just as our spiritual, permanent, and germinative principle now requires a body in keeping with its environment, so the same numerically identical principle will require, and will again weave for itself, a body, or organ, adapted to its new environment. When we know something about the nature of the new heaven and the new earth that are then to be we shall be better able to say something more definite about the new body which will correspond to them.

Meanwhile, one further thought should not be overlooked. The beginnings of the new order are made in this. When a man turns from Satan to God, from egoism to love, when he is made partaker of the Spirit from above, a process of reconstruction of the whole personality sets in. In this the physical has its share, as may be easily seen by anybody who will be at the pains to study the faces, gestures, and gait of the people he meets. It is not, therefore, a mere gratuitous guess which suggests that the resurrection body may be woven from materials already trained and fitted by the Spirit while it used a physical body. The process may be unintelligible, as indeed at bottom all life-processes are, but at all events it is not essentially different from the process by which Life uses the materials of the mineral world to construct the bodies of plants, and of the plant world to construct the bodies of animals. The bodies of animals, if this thought be pursued, may well be used to construct the bodies of those who are to be the angels, clad in a body of light. And with this prophetic vision, which is not proof, nor refractory to proof, we may be content to leave this part of our enquiry.

There remains, however, still the difficulty of tracing the genesis of St. Paul's thought. For it stands alone in the N.T., and has no support in any recorded words of our Lord's. He spoke of His second coming, of a catastrophe which would introduce a new order, of passing from death to life, of the dead in the graves hearing His voice and coming forth to judgment, of the resurrection of the righteous, and of " that world," but all this is either the resurrection of Chiliasm as understood by the apocalyptic, or else a contrast drawn between un-

spiritual and spiritual living.[1] And the whole tenour of Christ's life and teaching makes for the latter hypothesis.[2]

We are driven then to the belief that the doctrine of the resurrection of the body has its roots elsewhere than in the Gospel story, and that later speculations about the nature of Christ's resurrection body derive ultimately from the same beginnings.[3] It would be natural to look to Mithraism with its many remarkable points of resemblance to Christian doctrines, and its "doctrine of heaven and hell, of primitive revelation, of the mediation of the Logos emanating from the Divine, the atoning sacrifice, the constant warfare between good and evil, and the final triumph of the former, the immortality of the soul, the last judgment, the resurrection of the flesh, and the fiery destruction of the universe."[4] But Persian thought about the last things is better represented in Jewish apocalypses than in the epistles of St. Paul.[5] Nor is any support for the

[1] "The true antithesis is not between spirit and matter, or between spirit and form, but between a spiritual and an unspiritual *use* of the material vehicles of worship" (A. E. J. Rawlinson in *Foundations*, p. 390).

[2] Cf. Alger, *The Doctrine of a Future Life*, 10th ed. p. 324: "The true resurrection is, to come into the experience of the truth that God is not the God of the dead but of the living, for all live unto Him. Over the soul that is filled with such an experience death has no power. Verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead, the ignorant and guilty, buried in trespasses and sins, shall hear these truths declared, and they that believe shall lay hold of the life thus offered and be blessed." The resurrection to life, however, here spoken of as taught by Jesus, is not the resurrection of the body as taught by St. Paul and affirmed in the Creed.

[3] As, *e.g.*, those of St. Thomas Aquinas *In Pauli Epp.*, when commenting on 1 Cor. xv., he finds impassibility, clarity, agility, and subtlety as the four marks of the resurrection-body in general, where the conclusions are due as much to Reasoning as to the text.

[4] *Ency. Brit.* 11th ed. xviii. 624.

[5] Cumont, after describing how the soul of the righteous after death mounted through the seven heavens to eternal bliss in the eighth, goes on to say: "Une autre croyance, qui s'ajoutait à la première par une sorte

doctrine of the resurrection of the body forthcoming from Greek thought, and Indian thought in general denied all reality to the body and confined the evil which it was to this present order. There remains Egyptian religion, and this seems to afford some support to St. Paul's course of thought.

Egyptian thought and cult united old and new in a peculiar fashion. When Egypt took over anything new it did not allow it to banish or modify the old, but it merely added the new to the old whether accordant or discordant. This practice is seen in the numerous variants for the immaterial part of man, such as the *Ba* or heart, the *Ka* or double, the *Sahu* or " form," the *Khaib* or shadow, and above them all, the immortal Self or Osiris. " Concerning the future state of man there were at least three wholly contradictory theories—the Earthly, the Elysian, and the Solar theories ; and it is probable that the mummy theory is a fourth." [1] When the Osiris was separated from his body he set out on a perilous journey through the under world fortified by texts from the *Book of the Dead*, just as the devout Catholic is fortified by the rites of the Church. Finally, he was ushered into the Hall of the Double Truth, and appeared before the god Osiris and his forty-two assessors. His heart was weighed, and if it gave a good account of him he recovered his immortal elements already disjoined by death and was admitted into the circle of the gods.

In this blessed condition the man, now become

de superfétation, leur offrait la perspective de jouissances plus matérielles. La doctrine de l'immortalité de l'âme était complétée par celle de la résurrection de la chair," *Les Mystères de Mithra*, 1902, p. 121.

[1] W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Religion and Conscience in Ancient Egypt*, 1898, p. 49.

Osiris, is free of the three worlds. He is not under any necessity to reincarnate, but he is free to do so whenever he wants to. "Again and again the texts assert that the blessed may assume any form and visit any place at will; body and place can no longer enthral him. . . . The power of the soul to incarnate itself at pleasure became one of the chief reasons for embalming the body. . . . The preservation of the body was held to be necessary because the mummy was supposed to be the material form of which the Osiris was the essential reality. . . . The soul might sometimes visit the mummy, again take up its abode in its former body, and animating it anew, return to earth under that form and thus revisit the spots where once it had dwelt. To this end it required an earthly and tangible body, and this was supplied by the mummy. If the mummy were destroyed, then the soul not only lost one of the forms in which it might incarnate itself, but that one with which its interests were naturally most closely connected. . . . The destruction of the mummy did not involve the destruction of the soul, but it narrowed the soul's circle of activity and limited its means of transmigration." [1]

This close connection between body and soul was a ruling thought in Egypt during the period which saw the gradual formation of the Apostles' Creed, and it is hardly credible, all things considered, that its article on the "Resurrection of the Body" was constructed out of all relation to the Egyptian doctrine. The magical texts, for example, which were once classed almost as a matter of course under the head of Gnosticism spring out of this belief in

[1] A. Wiedemann, *The Ancient Egyptian Doctrine of Immortality*, 1895, p. 67 f.

the power of the blessed to reincarnate at will, or when duly commanded by the right word spoken by the right person at the right time and in the right way. But the facts of the life of Jesus Christ as given in the Creed often formed part of the magical formula used in rites of sanctification, purification, or exorcism.[1] Hence it is, to say the least, not improbable that the Egyptian doctrine of the freedom and capacity of the blessed dead helped to crystallise Christian thought when it came to be reflective.

Nor can this possibility be evaded by any suggestion that Egyptian thought figured the process which led to blessedness as setting in immediately after death and consummated in no long time, while Christian thought postponed the consummation till the Judgment Day—a Day still outstanding. For this Day was not always thought as being far off, and in the Fourth Gospel it was regarded as already here. Moreover, "the final judgment and the resurrection have no necessary connection."[2] And again, as the dominant Christian view regards the resurrection as the consequence of oneness with God, participation in His Spirit, and as believers have an "earnest" of this already here in the flesh there is no reason why the blessedness figured in Egyptian thought should be postponed necessarily to the "close of the age." In any case Jesus was

[1] Justin, *Dial.* 30, 85; *Apol.* ii. 6; Origen, *Contra Cels.* i. 6, iii. 24; Irenaeus ii. 49. 3; see Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, for the use of "the Name" in N.T. pp. 52-88, and in later times pp. 211 ff.

[2] R. H. Charles, "Eschatology" in *Ency. Bibl.* ii. 1375; Charles also points out that "in the writings of Paul" eschatology is in a state of development; that he began with an expectation inherited from traditional Judaism, "and entered on a process of development in the course of which the heterogeneous elements were silently dropped," and that his thought even in the last did not attain finality.

held to have already attained this blessedness, and union with Him was the guarantee of a similar attainment sooner or later. Christian thought, while holding fast to this expectation, came eventually to acquiesce in the inability of anybody but God to know the day or the hour of the " resurrection of the body."

If it be thought that Egyptian eschatology is too alien from Christian thought to justify us in connecting the two, the following from so orthodox a person as Professor C. A. Briggs may be cited : " The view that best commends itself to me, is that there is a spiritual body which underlies and gives shape and organisation to the physical body. This body is inseparable from the soul, goes forth with the soul at death, and in the intermediate state assumes the substance of the intermediate place of souls. When the final change comes for the ultimate state of existence at the resurrection, the same body takes to itself the substances of the final place of its abode : the body, the same in form and structure, but different in its substance.[1]

So, too, Weizäcker in discussing the nature of the appearance of the risen Christ to Peter and in appealing to the " oldest tradition of Jesus' teaching " says : " There can be no doubt that according to this tradition the souls of the pious were believed to live in a new kind of body, a body of an essentially heavenly quality. This is expressed in Jesus' answer to the question of the Sadducees about marriage, ' They shall there be as the angels of God.' This is in fact their resurrection. . . . Besides, we can refer here to the story of the Transfiguration, an incident exclusively designed to show Jesus trans-

[1] *Fundamental Christian Faith*, p. 209.

formed at this particular moment, even in his earthly life, into a heavenly form of light." [1]

It will be by this time clear that as the judgment has no necessary connection with the resurrection so neither has the intermediate state. The resurrection might take place immediately after death; indeed it might take place even in the flesh,[2] and in either case there would be no intermediate stage at all. But, on the other hand, Christian thought came to settle down, as the Parousia was delayed, to the conviction that there was an intermediate state, and that it was not a condition of dreamless sleep, but of activity, though the activity was less strenuous than in the flesh.[3]

But another account of the nature of this intermediate state has lately been revived in the form of the doctrine of reincarnation. It is obvious that this, too, has no necessary connection with the resurrection of the body, but is at best only a contingent preparation for it. It professes to tell us, in more or less intelligible language, a truth which does away with any intermediate state altogether by merging it in our present existence in the flesh. It does indeed borrow from Hindu thought a doctrine of Devachan,[4] but though life there is fabled as lasting through "many thousands of years," and as being on one side "formless," yet that life is our night sandwiched in between two days. We sow here, we reap there, or rather there we "consume and assimilate all the pure thoughts and emotions generated during earth-life" here. The story of man is the story of "his evolution by

[1] *Apostolic Age*, i. 15. [2] 2 Tim. ii. 18.

[3] This again was a characteristic note of Egyptian eschatology, though here the working is *after* the award of Osiris.

[4] "The theosophical name for heaven."

repeated incarnations into which he is drawn by desire, and from which he is set free by knowledge and sacrifice, becoming divine in potency as he had ever been divine in latency." [1]

There is no antecedent improbability in the doctrine of reincarnation, once there be granted that there exists a Self, or individual Spirit, or Thinker which is man. "None but very hasty thinkers will reject it on the ground of inherent absurdity. Like the doctrine of evolution itself, that of transmigration has its roots in the world of reality; and it may claim such support as the great argument from analogy is capable of supplying." [2]

Similarly Professor James Ward says: "If the notion of a merely bodily resurrection was incredible in Leibniz's day it is still more incredible in our own. Who expects to see trilobites and ammonites, the pterodactyle and the diplodocus come to life again? . . . At any rate 'metempsychosis' in some form seems an unavoidable corollary of thorough-going 'pampsychism' so long as we look broadly at the facts of life as a whole." [3] Neither of these writers, of course, expresses any opinion about the question of mere fact. It should be noticed that the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls has no necessary

[1] Those interested in the subject may consult Annie Besant's *Ancient Wisdom*, 1897, a work which can hardly be said to have any scientific value, since it proceeds on the method of the man who told his interlocutor that "he was not arguing, he was telling him"; the work of "Brother Atisha," entitled *Exposition of the Doctrine of Karma*, 1910, and *The Origin and History of Reincarnation, A Symposium*, 1912, may be consulted. Of theosophical writers in general it is enough to say that they construct marvellous cosmogonies out of the slenderest materials, that they lean to the mechanical interpretation of things, that they pile up their certainties on uncertainties, that their systems have no place for free-will, worship, or love of God, and that they have a doctrine of unreality but none of Reality.

[2] Huxley, *Evolution and Ethics*, 1894, p. 61.

[3] *The Realm of Ends*, 1912, pp. 212-213.

connection with reincarnation, though it may have much to do with incarnation.

Among reasons alleged for the hypothesis of Reincarnation are the following :

1. If souls be created specially for each birth it is difficult to see any rational ground for the death of infants. It would have been not impossible to Divine Wisdom to so arrange the mechanism of the universe that parents incapable of handing down a body which could last for more than a short time should be barred from handing one down at all. Can Divine economy be thought of as less efficient than human ? May there not be reason in the epitaph on the infant which ran—

> I wonder what I was begun for,
> Since I so speedily was done for ?

2. The inequalities of life are not necessarily examples of injustice, for justice does not demand equality of goods, conditions, opportunities, merit, social service, or reward, but equality of consideration.[1] Yet the constitution of most communities of which history tells the tale, and of all existing civilised communities discloses degrees of inequality which often amount to a negation of good in any sense. The man whose life is made miserable and shortened by inherited tendencies to venereal disease or drunkenness, or anti-social modes of life, the child born and bred in a slum, where physical and moral Well-being are below zero, present problems

[1] The rights of man " are all ultimately resolvable into the one supreme and unconditional right—*the right to consideration* " (Rashdall, *The Theory of Good and Evil*, i. 227). Dr. Rashdall res'ates Bentham's maxim, " Everyone to count for one and nobody for more than one " in the form : " Everybody's good to be treated as of equal value with the *like good* of everyone else " (*ibid.* i. 222).

which shock our sense of justice, however you may choose to define justice. The Good which is the end of all truly human conduct is beyond their reach through the whole of their life, and they die without ever having known that there is a land of eternal Beauty very far off. On the assumption that man was made for Good (however Good may be defined), it is difficult to see that this purpose is adequately fulfilled in more than a small proportion of human beings, so long as we hold that one life here is the only chance man has of qualifying for that Good.

Nor is this shock to our moral sense removed by the suggestion that the man with the receding forehead and no chin will be judged by what he might have done, and not by what he could not do. For we are still compelled to ask what necessity there is in the nature of things for some men starting as criminally disposed, as idiots, epileptics, or as tainted in any way. And if it be replied that all these things happen under Law, and are due to the violation of Law by some ancestor or other in the past, or to the carelessness or malevolence of some contemporary, then we are forced to ask why A should suffer because B was wicked. Why should my life be tormented with gout because my great-grandfather drank much port? That the world is so constituted that we do suffer for other people's misdoings to the third and fourth generation is unquestionable, but on what hypothesis can we square it with the maxim of distributive justice which lays down that the children's teeth should not be set on edge because the father's have eaten sour grapes?

Reincarnation offers just such an hypothesis. At all events it suggests that the shock to our moral sense may be lessened if the soul that suffers

vicariously can be thought of as having for some reason brought on itself under unbending Law just this condition under which it now suffers, or if it can be thought that the ultimate Good for which it is destined is unattainable except on condition of going through just that experience which we feel to be shocking. Unfortunately this Law that what a man sows that shall he reap is often described as an externally-imposed necessity inflicted as a punishment by God, a view which springs from the conception of God as an Assyrian monarch delighting in cruelty, or a usurer demanding remorselessly his pound of flesh. The Law, however, is less a law than a principle of action inherent in the nature of the doer, and when this principle issues automatically in the assignment to the soul of what appears to most to be harsh and loveless conditions, then we must say that these conditions are not punishment but discipline. They may spring out of past lives, but their purpose is a better future. The Lord is chastening the soul because He loves it, and for no other reason. And though we may not see it while the outward man is thus decadent the inner man may be drawing spiritual nutriment out of an environment which appears to be wholly evil.

This view is, of course, nothing better than an hypothesis, but as all hypotheses are provisional only it may be worth consideration until a better appears. The ordinary feeling which evades the difficulty by saying piously that the ways of God are inscrutable has doubtless good feeling on its side, but it is good feeling misdirected, and is less rational, in any case, than the most ill-founded hypothesis. For this latter does imply a belief that the world is rational.

3. The principle of Evolution which dominates modern thought is favourable to a theory of Reincarnation. For Evolution is based on a conscious or unconscious rejection of Hume's theory of Causality, and affirms that whatever had "a beginning must be accounted for and explained as the necessary outcome of something already in existence before that beginning." Its fundamental dogma is that the history of everything in space and time contains a *continuum* which is found as a constant in all its vicissitudes. Evolution does not necessarily demand a belief in a closed universe, though this is often tacitly assumed—as, for example, in deductions made from the hypothesis of the Conservation of Energy,—but it does demand a right to try to trace back the history of every phenomenon as far as our instruments will serve us to trace it. And its face is set against any theory which postulates new departures. It is obvious, therefore, that the theory of the new departure involved in "Creationism" as applied to souls must run the gauntlet of the whole evolutionary school. If, then, it rejects "Creationism," there seems left only Traducianism and Reincarnation. But Traducianism, or the theory which derives soul as well as body from the parents, is only possible to any Christian thought known to history if *soul* is limited to the *anima sensitiva aut vegetativa*.[1]

It is so limited by Alger, for example, who says :

[1] St. Thomas Aquinas teaches that the *anima* is threefold, vegetative, sensitive, and rational (*Summa*, 1a, q. 78. 1) ; that the vegetative soul is not created, 1a, q. 118. 1 ; that neither it nor the sensitive pre-exists in the semen (*ibid.*), yet that it is transmuted in the semen (*ibid.*) ; that there cannot be several souls in one body (1a, q. 76. 5) ; that there is only one, viz. the rational, which discharges the functions of a soul at once vegetative, sensitive, and intellectual (*ibid.* 1a, q. 76. 3). In all his body of doctrine he is following the Aristotelian tradition.

"That the soul of the child comes in some way from the soul of the parent, or is stamped by it, is also implied by the normal resemblance of children to parents, not more in bodily form than in spiritual idiosyncrasies. . . . As the body of the child is the derivative of a germ elaborated in the body of the parent, so the soul of the child is the derivative of a developing impulse of power imparted from the soul of the parent." [1] And he endorses the universally accepted scientific theory of *epigenesis* first put forward by Harvey according to which "the formation of the new organism by the process of generation takes place . . . by *epigenesis*, or successive differentiation of a relatively homogeneous rudiment into the parts and structures which are characteristic of the adult." [2]

This hypothesis of epigenesis, however, describes the method only and leaves untouched the motive power, for in any case whether we regard the soul as a product of matter as with "epi-phenomenalism," or as newly created, or as pre-existent, and then infused, the process at the last defies all our intelligence. All we are justified in saying under this heading is that Reincarnation is compatible with Traducianism, and also with epigenesis, and is also compatible with the spiritual nature of the Soul which Traducianism tends, but tends only, to deny. If the Soul be essentially rational (or spiritual) we can find nothing contradictory in the proposition that it is created afresh in each case by God, or that being already in existence it is united by the Divine Will to a body, but it is contrary

[1] *The Doctrine of a Future Life*, p. 15; the alternative "or is stamped by it" gives away the case.

[2] *Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., art. "Evolution," x. 29.

to truth and fact to trace the growth of the higher from the lower to the exclusion of all stimulus from the higher. To the Evolutionist, therefore, who is also a Theist, Reincarnation is a more plausible theory than either Creationism or Traducianism.

4. An indirect argument for Reincarnation may be borrowed from the tendency of current logic to see the universe as a related whole in which all the parts share the Reality of the whole and are themselves, therefore, real. "Without mind no orderly world" is one-half of its creed; "without an orderly world no mind" is the other, and Reality includes all the experience which the joint operation of these two principles has bestowed on us. "Subject and object grow together. The power and vitality of the one is the power and vitality of the other, and this is so because they are not two things with separate roots, but are both rooted in a common reality which, while it includes, is more than either." [1] But this unity of organised knowledge corresponds to a unity in the nature of things, and so extradites the dualism of "this world" and "that world." It certainly leaves room for the continuance of individuated spirits after they cease to be visible through union with a physical body, and so far may afford a theoretic base for Spiritualism, but (if sufficient proof were forthcoming) it would be best exemplified by the reappearance of such a spirit in a physical body, and by its resumption (with whatever modifications necessary) of its customary relations with the members of the world of ordinary experience. But this argument is no more than a presumption, and may be easily

[1] *Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., art. "Idealism," xiv. 285.

shown to carry no weight, whenever the scales are otherwise loaded against Reincarnation.

5. The growing sense of the value of Life over Mechanism testified to by the systems of thought of Schopenhauer, Bergson, and the Pragmatist school tends to suggest the conviction that three-score years and ten afford a stage far too small for the full growth of so fine a thing as a human soul. If an oak-tree take two hundred years to attain its full strength, will not a Soul require an indefinitely longer period? And the question will seem fatal to any doctrine of human life which restricts probation to this one present life here and now. But, of course, it does not exclude the possibility of a continued probation in different conditions in the Universe. Other planets, other suns or stars may afford pasturage and the power to go in and out; and for some souls they may be places adapted to their spiritual needs. But what is characteristic of this Earth of ours is that it affords opportunities for the stimulation of spiritual life through the sense-world, and what is more for the concentration, and therefore for the perfecting, of that spiritual life through mastery, negatively and positively, of the world revealed to and through the senses. And the law of Nature which consists in the production of effects through the least possible expenditure of force would seem to demand that where this sense-world has not yet finished its work on the Soul it should be afforded repeated opportunities until it has. And this is what is meant by, at all events, one theory of Reincarnation.

6. Greek thought held that in the beginning Chaos ruled, amorphous, cloudy, and dark, and that in due time, as Anaxagoras said, " Nous came

and set everything in order." The finite, that is, is superior to the infinite, or in modern language the actual is better than the potential. It is the spirit which makes of each human complex an ordered whole. But, on the other hand, it is the body which affords the spirit its principle of individuation. Apply the Orphic notion of the body being the tomb of the soul, and then at death you have not freedom but annihilation of the individual by its being merged in the Whole. We can no longer say :

> Eternal form shall still divide
> Eternal soul from all beside;
> And I shall know him when we meet.[1]

So that unless we are to accept the notion of the dew-drop slipping into the ocean we must maintain that the body is as necessary to spirit as spirit is to body. Without the one no life; without the other no Self; without a brotherhood of Selves no cosmos.

It is true indeed that this course of thought necessitates *a* body, but that it does not demand this physical body.[2] That is so; but again (1) so long as the needs of the spirit can be met by the physical body of this Earth alone, it would seem that the Spirit will somehow be assigned repeatedly such a physical body. (2) The whole course of progress, so far as man has been able to trace it, is by the higher carrying with it the lower, not by

[1] Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, 47.

[2] "Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
As the swift seasons roll;
Leave thy low vaulted past!
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast."
O. W. Holmes, *The Chambered Nautilus*.

its dropping the lower.[1] "As the smallest grain of dust is bound up with our entire solar system, drawn along with it in that undivided movement of descent which is materiality itself, so all organised beings, from the humblest to the highest, . . . do but evidence a single impulsion, the universe of the movement of matter, and in itself indivisible. All the living hold together, and all yield to the same tremendous push. The animal takes its stand on the planet, man bestrides animality, and the whole of humanity, in space and in time, is one immense army galloping beside and before and behind each of us in an overwhelming charge to beat down every resistance, and clear the most formidable obstacles, perhaps even death."[2] And it does not seem unreasonable to hold with the Egyptian thought referred to above (p. 476) that when the higher is reached the power to enter into possession of the lower and use it is not abrogated but confirmed and made permanent. This, too, seems to be what is involved in the doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus according to which the body which He takes is the body of each man who surrenders to Him, and lets Him now use him as an organ of His will. It would be a corollary from this doctrine to say that such free reincarnation is reserved for the

[1] "Each higher grade includes and embraces all the lower: minerals have ἕξις, plants ἕξις and φύσις; the lower animals ἕξις, φύσις and ψυχή, and man ἕξις, φύσις, ψυχή, and νοῦς; so that there is a real solidarity or unity stretching 'through all the mighty commonwealth of things,' not merely, as Wordsworth says,

'Up from the creeping plant to sovereign man,'

but from the lowest creations of even inorganic nature up to sovereign man; for God, according to the Stoics, is present even in the most ignoble forms of matter" (James Adam, *Vitality of Platonism*, 1911, p. 156).

[2] Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 1911, pp. 285-286.

spirits which have attained blessedness, and that any reincarnation which takes place prior to that is not of freedom but of necessity, not for action but for discipline.

On the whole we may say with Professor James Ward, "Any continuity of life with no continuity of either organism or environment seems quite inconceivable." "But there is nothing," he goes on to say, "in our present knowledge to show that there cannot be any other mode of embodiment than that with which we are here familiar, and that we have not manifold other relations with our environment besides those which the organism as we know it is supposed to explain." [1]

7. On any noble theory of life a Purgatory somewhere and somehow is a necessity. No thoughtful person nowadays, least of all since Bergson began to teach, holds the older view that our three-score years and ten entail either an eternity of bliss or an eternity of woe. We may confess that the boundaries of our knowledge are sadly restricted, but of one thing we are sure, and that is that such tremendous issues cannot depend on such inadequate pre-conditions if the World is the expression of Reason or Wisdom. Moreover, the extended view of space and time that modern thought offers to us, joined to a quickened sense of the Evil inherent in the world as it is, compel us to look for a Purgatory with sufficient time at its disposal to allow for the slow elimination of imperfections which we already see in Nature. But the general feeling of mankind, when in a calm hour it sits down to reflect, assures us that life on this earth offers all the discipline of thought, feeling, and will necessary for that purifica-

[1] *The Realm of Ends*, 1912, p. 399.

tion which must precede blessedness. If this be so, if this life be our Purgatory, it would follow that so long as we are stained with Evil, so long must we be liable to what St. James calls "the wheel of birth." [1]

The very inequality of the struggle for the moral life which we see around us suggests insoluble difficulties if our chance of heaven depends on this one life. Some seem good by nature, others have an extraordinary tendency to original sin, but all have to struggle for the establishment of the "habit" of virtue. And not only is the struggle unequal through some competitors being heavily handicapped, but, as far as we can see, even the most strenuous does not completely fulfil the conditions which entitle the victor to the prize. To few is it given to say, "I have finished the course, I have kept the faith"; the average man can hardly count himself to have apprehended at all, and all would probably affirm that at death their fight has but begun. And it is certain that the perfected life is attained only when the struggle, or the testing, or the purifying (these are but co-ordinant aspects of the same thing) is completed. If, then, it is not attained here and now, Nature insists on the task being taken up where it was laid down. And this *may* involve Reincarnation.[2]

[1] Τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως, 36, and see there Mayor's note.

[2] Cf. Rashdall, *The Theory of Good and Evil*, ii. 80: "It is difficult to see how, without some struggle, a virtuous character can be formed at all. Certainly in the absence of temptation the character cannot be tested; and until the character has been tested there would seem to be rather the potentiality of Virtue of character than the actuality of it. The struggle need not be always kept up, but it must have been gone through." Dr. Rashdall, however, concludes against the doctrine of the Pre-existence of Souls (which is not logically the same as the doctrine of Reincarnation) on the ground that for one difficulty it removes it creates a hundred (ii. 345-347). This, however, James Ward "makes bold to deny" (*Realm of Ends*, p. 404).

8. Some such doctrine as that of Reincarnation seems necessary if we are to face with hope and courage some of the most distressing examples of apparent total failure of souls in this life. The idiot, unless he has more lives here than the one he now cannot make adequate use of, is deprived of all capacity for ever of making the most of life on our planet. The sensualist who goes to his grave with untamed passions; the successful man of affairs who, heedless to the last of the claim of brotherhood, rides triumphantly to the Palace of Mammon over the bodies of the competitors he has crushed; or, again, the financier who at last fails in his calculations, and mad with rage and shame shoots himself; a Nietzsche, Weininger, Chatterton, Byron, Napoleon, and the myriads of strong souls who have passed away, early or late, but imperfect; the great mass of us who do not expect to die perfected, because we see none who have finished their education here,—all these leave behind them the feeling of doubt in the hearts of those who loved them, and of anxious questioning as to their future. Further probation, a more prolonged education still, if we could be sure that it would follow, would dispel this doubt and questioning, and, if it were otherwise made probable, the hypothesis of Reincarnation would satisfy the demands of the moral sense and of the heart.

9. No doubt Truth itself is sufficient reward for the earnest lover, and the pleasure of a conscience obeyed needs no further support, and yet the thought that the end of this life is also the end of our intellectual or moral treasure, that acquired qualities, no matter with what labour or merit made our own, are annihilated at death must, if

dwelt on, paralyse the nerve of effort by the inference that if this be so then all is vanity. And this thought is not to be dismissed summarily as the care of a part for itself. It springs rather from the nobler reluctance to admit that Nature is a spendthrift, and from a feeling that the end requires the husbanding of all co-operant means. But the supposition that nothing perishes, and that dexterity and wisdom won in the faithful service of the Good will fit their possessor for better service in his next life, will remove all temptation to apathy based on a suspicion of the futility of life.

"The individual, it may be, that falls out of the ranks for a time is not dead but only sleepeth, yet if he return not as the same identical person but only, so to say, as the same metaphysical entity . . . we are forced once more to ask what worth or meaning is there in such revolutions. . . . In a word without such spiritual continuity as theism alone seems able to ensure, it looks as if a pluralistic world were condemned to a Sisyphean task. *Per aspera ad astra* may be its motto, but *facilis descensus Averno* seems to be its fate."[1]

There is no reason for demanding that the returning Soul should remember its past life or lives, and claims to such remembering whenever made should be subjected to severe criticism. For, in the first place, the presumption is against them. Facts of experience are facts of mechanism and not of life so long as their material is not transmuted into faculty, and when the faculty is there the fact is superfluous. A man who spent his life in the study and practice of music might well begin his next life as a musical genius and be an "infant

[1] James Ward. *The Realm of Ends*, 1912, pp. 214-5.

prodigy " at the pianoforte at three years old, but it would be absurd to say that a recollection of having played the flute at Epidauros was a more cogent argument for Reincarnation than the power to write the Twelfth Mass or the Pastoral Symphony. A man's strength is best evidenced by the foot-pound force he can put forth, and is no better attested by his remembering the dinners and physical exercises which are now best showing themselves in his health and vigour. The same argument, of course, applies to all relationships which possess no intrinsic significance.

10. There are objects for which a man rightly lays down his life, such as his honour, the safety of those dependent on him, the good of his country, or the cause of humanity. And it may be held that a man who sacrifices his life for any of these objects gets all he can well expect in the happiness thus vicariously enjoyed in those he benefits. But the plea is unsatisfactory. The whole is not really benefited by any lowering of the vitality or opportunities of any single one of its members. It is right, no doubt, that the individual should think only of the larger life of the community and sacrifice his own well-being for it. But the whole could hardly be a moral whole if it could accept the sacrifice at the expense of its member. And the solution seems to be that the life is laid down only to be taken up again in a richer and more exalted degree, that in a very real sense he that lays down his life for honour, truth, goodness, or love—which are all attributes of Christ—receives it again thirty-fold, sixtyfold, or a hundredfold. And though this enhanced life is not necessarily to be found in renewed experience in a physical body, yet on the

whole it seems most fit that the crown should be worn in the arena where the fight took place.

But if the cumulative probability of the above ten considerations be still thought too slight even to form a working hypothesis, let us hasten to add that possibly Re-embodiment is the truth which lies at the heart of the conjecture of Reincarnation. And the grounds for this truth, it will probably be admitted, are far more solid than those on which Reincarnation rests. It would be better, therefore, to start the argument in support of Re-embodiment, and if that be shown to be valid then to enquire what grounds there may be for excluding the principle of Re-embodiment from acting on this planet on which we are now living.

However, whether these considerations be weighty or not—and some of them are less shadowy than others,—they do not affect directly the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body. For this doctrine belongs to Eschatology, and not to the constant course of things before the end. And its fundamental tenet is that in the completed state man will still be the man we know composed of body and spirit, so that the "other side" will be found of a piece with "this side." He who made this world Divine by entering it also makes that world human by carrying there the body of His humiliation, now a glorious body without spot or wrinkle or any such thing.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE TWELFTH ARTICLE

Everlasting life

Εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον

"THE *eternal life* is the eternal life that follows the resurrection of the body and the final judgment; and not the eternal life which begins, according to the Gospel of John, with the new birth in this world, or that which begins immediately after death." [1] To show that this threefold division of what is one and undivided is unwarranted by Christian tradition will be the object of the following pages. It will be best to begin with what Professor Briggs wholly ignores, viz. the precise meaning of the word rendered in our Creed *everlasting*.[2]

ΑΙΩΝ

O.T. Usage

Aeon is a term which is of frequent occurrence both in the LXX and in the N.T. In the LXX as

[1] C. A. Briggs, *Fundamental Christian Faith*, p. 209.

[2] It is true that Professor Briggs when he comes to deal with the Nicene Creed says: "The phrase *the age to come* is a richer expression than *eternal*. *The age to come* is the age subsequent to the second advent and resurrection of the dead, as distinguished from the *present age*, *the age that now is*, which

a translation of *olam* (עוֹלָם) it denotes "the beginning of an era, its end or a time whose end or beginning withdraws itself from perception," from a root *alam* (עלם), to conceal.[1] Several meanings of aeon are distinguishable.[2]

(1) *The Beginning.*—The Hebrew, מֵעוֹלָם, is rendered ἀπ' αἰῶνος, or ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος in the following passages: Gen. vi. 4, "giants from of old"; Ps. xxv. 6, "thy loving-kindnesses which have been from of old"; xciii. 2, "thou art from of old"; cxix. 52, "thy judgments of old"; Isa. xlii. 14, "I have been silent from of old"; xlvi. 9, "the former things of old"; lxiv. 4, "from of old we heard not"; Jer. ii. 20, "of old didst thou break thy yoke." Add to these eight passages Jer. xxviii. 8 and Joel ii. 2. In all these passages the root idea is that of the beginning of an era as distinct from the length of time which has since elapsed, and indeed the same Hebrew phrase is translated ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in Josh. xxiv. 2, Isa. lxiii. 16, 19. That this is the precise idea intended becomes more clear in the phrase of Prov. viii. 23, πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος, and of Ps. lxxiv. 12; and from the phrase πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων of Ps. lv. 19.

(2) *The End.*—The Hebrew, לְעוֹלָם, is rendered εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα in the LXX 114 times, and the same Greek phrase is also given as the rendering of similar Hebrew phrases in 38 other passages, and in all the implicit sense is "until the end of the era."

---

precedes the resurrection and the second advent that introduces it" (C. A. Briggs, *Fundamental Christian Faith*, pp. 266-7); but he makes no attempt to justify his tacit assumption that Christianity took over the temporal distinction between *this age* and *that age* without, as in other things, raising it to a higher power.

[1] But see Driver-Briggs' *Lexicon*, p. 761.

[2] The writer borrows partly in what follows from a *Note on* Αἰών published by him in 1911.

The plural εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, which is to be regarded as an intensive form of the singular, occurs 15 times. Another Hebrew phrase, עַד עוֹלָם, is rendered ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος 50 times in the sense "until the end of the era," and the same Greek phrase occurs without the article 5 times. And in all, though the idea of duration of time is certainly included, yet it seems derivative and not primary. Or, if the expression be preferred, we may say that the notion of "time how long" is got at by saying that it lasts till the end of the era under which we are now living.

(3) *The Nature of Existence.*—In the adjectival form αἰώνιος is an attribute of God as in Gen. xxi. 33, Job xxxiii. 12, Isa. xxvi. 4, xl. 28, lx. 19, Sus. 42; or of His name, Ex. iii. 15; frequently of His law;[1] of His covenant;[2] His kingdom, Dan. iv. 3, vii. 27;[3] His authority, Dan. iv. 34, vii. 14; His mountains, Ps. lxxv. 4,[4] Micah ii. 9,[5] Hab. iii. 6, cf. mountains of God, Ps. xxxvi. 6; His way, Job xxii. 15, Ps. cxxxviii. 24, Jer. vi. 16, what He gives or effects, as *e.g.* an aeonian reproach, Ps. lxxviii. 66; Jer. xxiii. 40, xxv. 9; Dan. xii. 2; an aeonian place, Isa. xxxiii. 14;[6] aeonian rejoicing, Isa. xxxv. 10, li. 11, lxi. 7; aeonian kindness, Isa. liv. 8; an aeonian name, Isa. lvi. 5, lxiii. 12; aeonian love, Jer. xxxi. 3; aeonian sleep, Jer. li. 39; aeonian desert, Isa. lviii. 12, Ez. xxvi. 20, xxxv. 9, xxxvi. 2; aeonian salvation, Isa. xlv. 17; aeonian righteousness, Dan. ix. 24; and, once only, aeonian life, Dan. xii. 2. In all these passages the primary idea seems to be that the thing qualified

[1] Twenty-three times, especially in Exodus and Leviticus.
[2] Twelve times. [3] Cf. Ps. cxlv. 13, "kingdom of all the aeons."
[4] LXX. [5] LXX. [6] LXX.

is of Divine origin, then that it shares in some Divine attribute, and only derivatively, therefore, that it is of aeonian duration. That it is the spiritual character rather than the duration of things which is in question throughout is made more probable from Eccles. iii. 11, where the Preacher says that God gave the aeon in its fulness to the heart of all things,[1] where the spiritual character of the aeon accounts for the difficulty men have in knowing the thing which God has made. The aeon or invisible thing in it eludes him.

N.T. Usage

(1) *The Beginning.*—It is noteworthy that the N.T. writers maintain a forward look, and while they refer again and again to what is to be hereafter, they are almost silent about the beginning. Luke i. 70, John ix. 32, Acts iii. 21, xv. 18, 1 Cor. ii. 7, seem to be the only exceptions, and as we shall see directly they belong to another stratum of thought —that in which *αἰών* has a personal meaning.

(2) *The End.*—Of the 106 passages where the word *αἰών* occurs in the N.T. by far the greater part refer it to the future. The phrase usually translated for ever (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*), carries with it the idea of till the end of the age. Thus God's words, or His righteousness, or His rule hold good to the end;[2] or a fate, or punishment, or threat, or a resolve, or a gift lasts till the end.[3] Similarly with the plural form (*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*) which must be

[1] עֹלָם, LXX *σύμπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα.*

[2] Luke i. 55, Matt. xxi. 19, 2 Cor. ix. 9, Heb. i. 8, v. 6, vi. 20, vii. 17, 21, 24, 28, 1 Peter i. 25.

[3] Matt. xxi. 19, Mark iii. 29, 1 Cor. viii. 13, 1 John ii. 17, 2 John 2, Jude 13.

regarded as a Hebrew intensification of the singular. God's rule, or glory, lasts through all ages. This form is found in Luke i. 33, Rom. i. 25, ix. 5, xi. 36, xvi. 27, 2 Cor. xi. 31, Gal. i. 5, Phil. iv. 20, 1 Tim. i. 17, 2 Tim. iv. 18, Heb. xiii. 8, 21, 1 Peter iv. 11, v. 11, Jude 25. In the Apoc. the phrase occurs 13 times as a standing doxology.[1]

(3) *The Nature of Existence.*—In the Greek O.T., as we have seen, the qualitative character of *αἰών* is best and most clearly expressed by its adjective *αἰώνιος*. The same is true of the N.T. usage, with one important difference to which we shall refer immediately.

In addition to the 106 passages where the substantive aeon is used in the N.T. there are 71 passages where the adjective aeonian occurs. It is an epithet of Life 44 times, including the 17 passages in the Fourth Gospel—where it qualifies no other term. These are Matt. xix. 16, 29, xxv. 46, Mark x. 17, 30, Luke x. 25, xviii. 18, 30, the 17 passages in the Fourth Gospel, Acts xiii. 46, 48, Rom. ii. 7, v. 21, vi. 22, 23, Gal. vi. 8, 1 Tim. i. 16,

[1] In the Fourth Gospel the time-reference is unfortunately (but wrongly) suggested by the majority of the texts where the phrase (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*) occurs being negative, and by their thus suggesting "never" as the readiest translation. But a closer consideration will show that the author's use of the phrase is (1) pregnant, and (2) sets the timeless order in antithesis to the time-order. Thus "he shall live unto the aeon" in vi. 51-58=he shall pass from death unto life. "He shall not thirst for the aeon" in iv. 14=he will be enjoying (and therefore not thirsting for) Divine life; the antithesis between the slave and the son in viii. 35 is that the former has no abiding hold on Divine life such as the latter has; viii. 51, 52 in the sentence is pregnant=he shall not have to gaze on death because he has already passed into the aeonian realm. The same holds good of x. 28, xi. 26 which=they shall not perish because they already belong to the aeon; in xii. 34 the crowd's interpretation is clarified by being equated with the lifting up of the Son of Man into the Divine realm; Peter's phrase in xiii. 8 is corrected similarly, *i.e.* to have the feet washed *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*= to have part in the life of the Master; lastly, in xiv. 16 the work of the Paraclete is to abide with the disciples and lead them into the Divine life.

vi. 12, Tit. i. 2, iii. 7, 1 John i. 2, ii. 25, iii. 15, v. 11, 13, 20, Jude 21. And in all these passages *aeonian* is qualitative, not quantitative. It describes the kind of life, not its duration. In that case we are afforded a strong presumption that in the remaining passages its use is similar. Aeonian is used of fire in Matt. xviii. 8, xxv. 41, Jude 7; of discipline, Matt. xxv. 46; sin, Mark iii. 29; dwellings, Luke xvi. 9; times, Rom. xvi. 25; 2 Tim. i. 9, Tit. i. 2; God, Rom. xvi. 26; glory, 2 Cor. iv. 17, 2 Tim. ii. 10, 1 Peter v. 10; things, 2 Cor. iv. 18; house, 2 Cor. v. 1; thing, Philem. 15; destruction, 2 Thess. i. 9; exhortation, 2 Thess. ii. 16; power, 1 Tim. vi. 16; salvation, Heb. v. 9; judgment, vi. 2; redemption, ix. 12; Spirit, ix. 14; inheritance, ix. 15; covenant, xiii. 20; Kingdom, 2 Peter i. 11; gospel, Apoc. xiv. 6. In all these passages the adjective *aeonian* carries the denotation of heavenly or spiritual rather than of eternal or everlasting, and this even in Rom. xvi. 25, 26, 2 Tim. i. 9, and Tit. i. 2, where the temporal meaning might seem at first to be the natural if not necessary meaning. This heavenly, or spiritual, order is one which is not postponed to another state of existence, but is realisable here in the physical body.[1]

There is, however, one passage which seems to stand by itself, viz. Matt. xiii. 22,[2] where the "care of the aeon" is set in antithesis to the "word of the kingdom." But a little reflection will bring us

[1] The following texts, in which the two aeons are contrasted as two dispensations which are different in quality, may be consulted with advantage. Such are: Matt. xii. 32, xiii. 39, 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 20, Mark x. 30, Luke xvi. 8, xviii. 30, xx. 34, 35, Rom. xii. 2, 1 Cor. i. 20, ii. 6, 8, iii. 18, 2 Cor. iv. 4, Gal. i. 4, Eph. i. 21, 1 Tim. vi. 17, 2 Tim. iv. 10, Titus ii. 12.

[2] Par. Mark iv. 19.

to see that this is only a particular case of the Rabbinical opposition of "this world" and "that world" which becomes in Christian teachers the opposition between the visible and the invisible, Self and God.[1]

(4) *Personal.*—But just as the meaning of world-time in the text just cited shaded off easily into world-content, so does it pass over with equal ease into that of world-governor, when once the idea has gained currency that different ages, or different states, have over them different rulers. This personal reference seems clear in texts which point to inspiration by a person as in Acts xv. 18, where God's doings are revealed "from Aeon" as their source, and in Luke i. 70, Acts iii. 21, where His prophets derive their inspirations "from Aeon."[2] So in John ix. 32 it is said that *Aeon*[3] has never been reported as opening the eyes of the blind. In Eph. ii. 2 the "aeon of this world" is clearly a personal being, and in 1 Tim. i. 17 God is called "the King of the aeons."[4] Nor can any one who is familiar with gnostic literature doubt that the aeons of Col. i. 26, from whom "the economy of the mystery" was hidden, were personal powers. This conclusion is strengthened, not weakened, by the addition of *geneai* here to *aeons*, for all that this says is that as the mystery was not known to aeons so it was not known to a class of inferior beings

[1] "When *olam* came to denote a period of time stretching out from our now . . . in which all our known life is included, the contents of this sphere would naturally be called by the same name, *i.e.* the world . . . the complex of all matter and force, all causes and phenomena which arrange themselves in uninterrupted temporal sequence and constitute the life-sphere" (Orelli, *Die heb. Syn. der Zeit und Ewig.* p. 82).

[2] Ps. xciii. 2 is not parallel.

[3] *I.e.* the ruler of this world.

[4] Cf. 1 Clement, xxxv., δημιουργὸς καὶ πατὴρ τῶν αἰώνων.

called "geneai," just as in Luke i. 48 it is said that all *geneai*, that is, all the superhuman *geneai*, should call Mary blessed. (In Eph. iii. 21 the preposition εἰς of the phrase "to all the *geneai* of the aeon of the aeons" means "so far as they are concerned," or "reaching to"; cf. the use of εἰς in Col. i. 16, 29.[1]) Moreover, in Col. i. 26 the temporal sense of *aeon* is not demanded by the now of the succeeding clause, for the antithesis is between aeons and saints. What was denied to the former is given to the latter, and to this primary antithesis that of past and present is secondary. The same personal meaning of *aeon* meets us again in 1 Cor. ii. 7, "before the aeons." In 2 Peter iii. 18 "the day of Aeon" can hardly be anything else but a variant of the Hebrew "day of the Lord," in which case *aeon* is but another name for God Himself.

In Heb. i. 2 it is said that God created the aeons by His Son, where again the personal interpretation is inevitable. Similarly in Heb. xi. 3, the more rational, if not necessary, interpretation is that by faith we come to understand that the aeons or invisible rulers of the world of appearances were set by the Word of God, and that the visible world

[1] But cf. Eusebius (*Praep. Evang.* i. 10) in his description of "The Theology of the Phoenicians," according to which Chaos and Darkness were the boundless principle of the universe. They mingling produced Desire, which became the principle of creation, and then Spirit and Desire produced Mot, the mother. From her came the heavenly bodies and all animals, non-intelligent and intelligent, and the winds, as is written in the book of Thoth. From the wind Colpia and his wife Baau (or night) came Aeon and Primogenitus, both mortals. From these were born Genos and Genea, who taught men to worship Baalsamin, the heavenly Zeus. Again, from Genos, son of Aeon and Primogenitus, were born mortals called Light and Fire and Flame. After this Eusebius goes on to quote from Sanchoniathon the story of the origin of arts, of mysteries, and of the gods in a system where Asiatic, Greek, and Egyptian legends are jumbled together in confusion.

is the outcome of their activities as they in their turn are of God's.

In 1 Cor. x. 11 the personal interpretation does not exclude the temporal, but neither is it excluded by it. The end of the aeons may as well be the end of their rule as of the ages. But in Eph. iii. 11 the case seems clear for aeons as personal rulers for, as in Col. ii. 26, the antithesis is between the revelation made through the aeons and that made through the Church of Christ in accordance with the establishment (prothesis) of the aeons which He made in or by Christ Jesus. The Knowledge of the Church is contrasted with the lesser Knowledge possessed by the aeons. In Gal. i. 4, already referred to, the personal sense of " this present evil aeon " seems preferable.

Another relevant text is 1 Cor. xi. 6, translated in R.V. as " the rulers of this world," where the genuine meaning is given by recollecting that St. Paul's scheme was that of the world being under an Aeon of wickedness, deliverance from whom was given by the Saviour. The wisdom which was effecting this was hidden from the archons of the Aeon now in possession. An interesting parallel to this view is afforded by the Freer-logion in which the sequence is given to Mark xvi. 14, as follows : " And they replied saying : that this Aeon of lawlessness and unfaith was under Satan who did not allow them through unclean spirits to receive the truth of God." [1] Here, again, the time-reference or the secondary meaning appears less preferable. The " aeonian sin " and " no remission against the aeon " of Mark iii. 29 ; the " aeonian honour " of 1 Tim. vi. 16 ; " this aeon and the coming aeon "

[1] Dibelius, *Forsch. zur Rel. und Lit. des A. u. N.T.* Heft xv. 27.

of Matt. xii. 32, all bear a reference to a region ruled by an Aeon, and if they are patient of a temporal meaning, are so only because aeons succeed aeons in heaven as kings do kings on earth. It only needs to add that in the class of passages quoted above the word aeon is more often anarthrous as in Luke i. 70, and that the phrase " prophet of the Highest," in v. 76, lends support to the interpretation of *Aeon* in the former text as being " prophets sent from the Aeon."

This personal reference in the term *αἰών* does not meet us in the LXX, and its origin, therefore, must be sought elsewhere. And the difficulty caused by this N.T. usage cannot any longer be evaded by denying or ignoring the fact that personal aeons are distinctly believed in and affirmed by N.T. writers. They are there as a stubborn fact, and as they did not come there out of the Greek O.T. we must look for their origin elsewhere. And the only other place to look to is that complex known as Hellenism.

Gnostic Usage

Before giving instances of this Hellenistic usage it may be desirable to point out that the period immediately preceding and that accompanying the rise of Christianity was obsessed by the belief in demons, was tossed about between reverence for such gods as had survived the assaults of sceptical philosophy and an inner disbelief in them altogether, and was gradually settling down to a practical dualism in which the God of Light and the prince of darkness were opposed. " Even where the national gods were looked upon as dead idols—

and that was perhaps the rule . . . one could not help assuming that there were mighty demons operating behind them, as otherwise the frightful power of idolatry could not be explained." [1] At the period, however, with which we are concerned it is important to note that in spite of some centuries of free discussion theological terms were still in a fluid condition. It is not in the case of *αἰών* alone as a personal attribute that we shall find this fluidity. The term *God* also was a variable. In one sense every cultured soul was a god even though circumscribed. Marcus Aurelius speaks of the god dwelling in man. The Stoics " distinguished, as Plato had done, between the eternal and immutable God and gods created and transitory, between God the Creator and Sovereign of the world and subordinate Gods; in other words between the universal divine power as a Unity working in the world and its individual parts and manifestations. The former they denoted by the term Zeus; to the latter they applied the names of the other subordinate Gods." [2] Hence the heroes of antiquity, personified qualities, the popular gods, the sages and " demons " were all brought under this second category. Similarly, Simon Magus could call himself the " great Power of God "; the Roman emperors were addressed as " dominus ac deus noster," or as *Καῖσαρ αὐτοκράτωρ θεός*. Great teachers such as Diogenes, Heracleitus, Peregrinus were called gods, and indeed every man so far as he was inhabited by *νοῦς*. God so far as He was one

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. 181 *n.*; in another passage, iii. 126 *n.*, Harnack says: " It would be impossible to believe more sincerely in demons than Christians did in the second century."

[2] Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, p. 328.

was regarded as transcendent. As immanent He shared His name of God with whatever He showed His invisible being in in an eminent degree.[1]

We may now adduce a few passages which show that *αἰών* as well as *θεός* was at once an elastic term and a personal epithet at the same time.

In a Hermetic prayer it is said : " His true form none of the gods can see, since the Aeon of Aeons is transformed into them in all the acts of beholding." [2] And again : " The great living God who is over the aeons of aeons " [3] " commands thee " ; [4] and again : " Thou art Lord of hope, wealth-giving *aeon*, holy agathodaemon." [5] In another Hermetic prayer Isis is addressed as the moon-goddess, as Sophia, and as the *aeon* : " Thou art the beginning and the end, and thou above rulest over all, for of thee are all things and to (thee as) *aeon* do they run as to their end." [6] Again : " God makes the *Aeon*, the *Aeon* makes the World, the World makes Time, and Time Generation," where Aeon is the power of God, the Son of God, a second God.[7] The Naasene sermon given by Hippolytus speaks of the virgin having conceived and borne a Son who was not psychical, not physical, but the blessed aeon of the aeons.[8]

In Papyrus 46 in Brit. Mus. the magician says : " I am the handmaid of the Aeon." And again the Creator is invoked as the " unmoved Aeon." In a Parisian papyrus : " Thee, the One and blessed One of the Aeons, the Father of the world, I invoke

[1] See Harnack's interesting note in *History of Dogma*, i. 119, and Zeller, *ubi supra*, ch. xiii.

[2] Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, xxiii.

[3] *Εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, which seems to suggest that the same phrase in the N.T. should be rendered as here.

[4] Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 28. [5] *Ibid.* p. 30. [6] *Ibid.* p. 270.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 275. [8] *Ref.* v. 3 *sub finem*.

with cosmic prayers." In the same papyrus: "The Sophia which is the Aeon." Irenaeus i. 17, speaking of the Ophites, refers to the "primal Sophia and Aeon." Hippolytus also says that the mighty Aeon hypostatised the sufferings of Achamoth.[1] In a Hymn of Hermes[2] "Seven planets are driven along the Olympian road of the Sun, and with them ever revolves the Aeon." In the great Parisian Zauber-codex again the candidate declares that he is about to be "exalted by the power of the Almighty and by the right hand of the Immortal, with deathless Spirit, to gaze on the deathless Aeon and lord of the fiery crowns." And again: "The Aeon shakes, the Heaven will tremble."[3]

In an inscription of Antiochus of Commagene[4] it is said: "Send my soul beloved of God to the infinite Aeon." The Sibylline Oracles[5] say that "Hades is guarded by a Key-guardian Aeon of the great prison"; and Horapollo[6] says: "They describe the sun and moon by the symbol of an Aeon through the elements being aeonian."

According to Philo of Byblos,[7] in the Phoenician cosmogony *Genea* is the daughter of the Aeon or First begotten, and the Aeon's sons are Fire, Flame, and Light. In the Leyden Papyrus containing what is called the *Monas or Eighth Book of Moses*, in the section for opening of a door through the Name, the Power invoked is called "the Aeon of Aeons, the Only One who by His exceeding power goes through the place." The double-bodied, lion-headed figure of Mithras as the Aeon is familiar.

[1] *Ref.* v. 1-32.
[2] Stob. *Ecl.* i.
[3] Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, p. 4; *Abraxas*, p. 53.
[4] Michel, *Recueil*, No. 735, 1-40.
[5] viii. 122.
[6] i. 1.
[7] Eusebius, *Praep. Evan.* i. 9, 10, iv. 16.

It will be observed that in all these cases the Aeon is a personal object, a ruler of the world, whether supreme or subordinate. Similarly, the late Mr. James Adam translates *Aeon* in Pindar (*Fragment* 131) as *the living man*, and says that it never means *eternity* in Pindar.[1] So, too, Rohde[2] points out that in Pindar the *soul* is called "the image of the aeon," and that this is not merely a synonym for *life*, or "for the totality of immaterial powers regarded as a unitary being or a single concept," but is rather the older folk-belief in the soul as another Self, a Doppelgänger, as that part of men which alone proceeds from the gods. "The body follows death who has power over all; but the image of the aeon remains living, for it alone is from the gods."[3]

There are passages, however, where *Aeon* may describe either the ruler or the region he rules, as in the Naasene Hymn given by Hippolytus[4] where Jesus says: "Having the seals I will descend, through all the Aeons I will journey." When it is said in the *Pistis Sophia*, "Get ye back, Ialdabaoth and Choncho, ye archons of the third Aeon,"[5] the last word may belong either to the ruler or to his province,[6] though the former is made more probable by the phrase in another place which refers to being set free from "the archons of the Aeon and the Archons of Fate and of the Sphere."[7] In the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 64, the ecstatics are said to

[1] *Vitality of Platonism*, p. 36; Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, p. 277, says that "the word αἰών in the usage of the Platonists of the time (second or third century) certainly included the idea of endless, changeless duration."

[2] *Psyche*, p. 499 *n*. [3] Fr. 131. [4] Phil. v. 1.

[5] Cf. Anz, *Ursprung des Gnostizismus*, p. 27.

[6] Schmidt, *Kopt.-gnost. Schriften*, i. 225.

[7] P. 25; Anz, *Ursprung des Gnostizismus*, p. 32.

"enter into the vision of the spirit,[1] into the rational [2] and aeonian marriages of the syzyge," [3] where there is no reason for rendering aeon or aeonian as having the meaning of *eternal*. It keeps the connotation of its primary personal character.

The early Christian writers, whether apologists, exegetes, or apocalyptics, reflect also this conception of *αἰών* as personal.

In the *Death of Joseph*,[4] Jesus prays that the soul of Joseph may be guarded past "the seven aeons of darkness," and Gabriel is described as "the evangelist of the aeons of light." [5] Philo [6] says that "God is withdrawn from both ends of Time. For His Life is not so much Time as Eternity,[7] the archetype and pattern of Time. And in Eternity there is nothing past and nothing future, but only present." St. Gregory, Naz.: [8] "Eternity [9] is neither Time nor a part of Time, nor measurable; but what Time is to us, as being measured by the course of the sun, that is eternity [10] to things everlasting." [11] John Damascene: [12] "It behoves us to know that the meanings of *αἰών* are many; for it means the life of each man, a period of a thousand years, this present order, that which is to follow it, the endless life after the resurrection, and again not time nor a part of time"—he then quotes Naz. as above. "Aeternitas quae Dei propria est initium excludit et successionem ac mutabilitatem et postremo finem" (Petavius, *De*

[1] Αἰῶνες νοεροὶ γενόμενα. [2] Νοεροί.
[3] Dieterich, *Mithrasliturgie*, p. 129.
[4] *Texts and Studies*, iv. 140. [5] *Ibid.* p. 158.
[6] *Quod Deus sit immut.* 6. [7] Αἰών.
[8] *Oratio* xxxviii. in Migne, tom. xxxvi. col. 320.
[9] Αἰών. [10] Αἰών. [11] Ἀϊδίοις.
[12] *De fide orthod.* ii. 1.

Deo, iii. 3); cf. esp. notes to pp. 258-260, ed. 1857, for reference to Plato.[1]

Ignatius[2] says that the virginity of Mary was hidden from the prince of this aeon, and goes on to ask how the Lord's coming was manifested to the aeons, from which two passages it is clear that *archon* and *aeon* are interchangeable.

Irenaeus scoffs at the Marcosians for saying that they were free from the judge, and if brought before him had only to invoke Sophia as "the assessor of God and of the mystical Sige who was before the aeons," where "before the aeons" affords a comment on 1 Cor. ii. 7, x. 11, Eph. iii. 11.

Clement Al.[3] says: "As much as the image is inferior to the living face, so much is the world inferior to the living Aeon." At the end of the Paedagogus in hymning the Alone-Father he says: "for whom in eternity, whose members we all are, whose glory are the Aeons."

In his *Excerp. ex Theod.* 47, he speaks of the "Catholic Saviour" projecting a Divine image of the Father, who in his turn becomes a Father and projects first the psychical Christ, and then the archangels as images of the aeons.[4] Again, ch. xxxii., Clement says that "each of the aeons, there being unity in the Pleroma, has his own pleroma (or complement), viz. his syzyge. And they say that what proceeds from the syzyge is a pleroma, and what from one is an image." Cf. also ch. xli.

[1] Dieterich, *Nekyia*, 4, quotes from an Akhmim Apok: "Of which kind the Aeon is in whom are all they who have this glory."

[2] Eph. 19.

[3] *Strom.* iv. 13.

[4] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* i. 5. 1, also speaks of the Holy Spirit being projected for the fruitbearing of the Aeons, and also of the created (γεννητούς) aeons being separated from the uncreated Father.

In Origen [1] we are told of the words which are to be spoken by the Redeemer in His descent "after He has passed the gates fastened by the aeon of the archons." [2] Epiphanius tells us that the Cainites, as possessed of the gnosis, could not be injured in their upward journey by the Maker of this world, but were hidden from Him, and transferred to the aeon above.[3]

It is not necessary for our present purpose to quote at any length passages from Hellenism to show that αἰώνιος (or αἰών) was also used as a synonym for ἀΐδιος, *perpetuus*. The Inscriptions alone sufficiently testify to this, and no doubt of it exists.[4] But our present purpose is to show that αἰώνιος was in current use before and when the final article of the Creed was inserted as (1) describing a heavenly person, or group of persons, and also (2) as frequently marking the quality of the state or of the being so described. If the word is used frequently of duration, it is also used as frequently of that which alone gives duration its worth, and

[1] *Contra Celsum*, vi. 31.

[2] Anz, *Ursprung des Gnostizismus*, p. 13. Origen himself certainly used the word αἰώνιος in its temporal meaning of not endless but of indefinite duration. Cf. *In Exodum*, hom. vi. 13, where, however, he is borrowing the Hebrew phrase. *In Lev.* hom. xiii. 6 he says: "Legitimum namque et aeternum est omne quod mysticum est," where *aeternum* means eternal *because* Divine.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 24.

[4] It will be enough to refer to the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, chs. xl. and lxxiii., where the Messiah is spoken of as having a principate, and as sitting down in peace *for the age*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, and to Diodorus of Sicily, i. 51. 2 and i. 93. 1; Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 1901, p. 363, compares the "aeonian kingdom" of 2 Peter i. 11 with an inscribed decree of the inhabitants of Stratonicea in Caria where the "aeonian authority" of the Roman lords is referred to. But it is by no means clear that 2 Peter does not mean by aeonian *divine*. Deissmann also prints the Greek text of a tablet of lead containing an incantation. The tablet was found at Adrumetum in 1890 and contains the following (line 8): "I adjure thee, the great god, the aeonian and super-aeonian and all-governor who art above the gods above." Cf. also Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, 1902, pp. 147-158, where the Jewish usage is discussed; and Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 1905, p. 83.

even when the primary meaning is that of duration there will be found implicit in it an *a priori* judgment of value. *Aeonian life* is not merely unending life, not merely the ordinary life of men renewed and continued indefinitely or even infinitely, but a life which is the life of the world of Reality, the Divine life, and therefore unending. It is eternity as defined by Boethius :[1] "Aeternitas est interminabilis vitae tota simul et perfecta possessio." That this usage is found in the N.T. side by side with the temporal meaning will be clear to anybody who will turn back to the quotations referred to above on pp. 498, 500-1.

The conclusion to be drawn from the above examination of the word αἰώνιος is that "eternal" is an unsatisfactory rendering, and that "everlasting" is at best partial and misleading. It is the kind of life that is in question, and not its duration, or rather the duration depends on its quality. If it be Divine life then eternity is one of its attributes ; if it be a life which is a gift of God its duration depends on the nature of the gift and on the righteousness of God. The gift may be absolute or conditional on its being justified by the recipient. In the latter case the duration may be short, or indefinitely prolonged, or may become unending : "Eternity appears then not as the prolongation of time . . . but as an expression for the permanence of value during the alteration of the times."[2] We have now to see what kind of life we are concerned with.

[1] *De consol. philosophiae*, v. 6.

[2] Höffding, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 56 ; cf. the excellent remarks of James Ward, *The Realm of Ends*, 1912, p. 476.

Life

Ζωή

The word ζωή occurs in the N.T. 135 times. In 41 of these it is accompanied by the adjective αἰώνιος.[1] In 28 passages ζωή is defined by the definite article alone,[2] from which it is plain that *life* was a synonym for the Christian religion, requiring for Christians no nearer description. Or the life is defined as that in the coming aeon,[3] or it is *this* life,[4] or the life of Christ,[5] or of God,[6] or Christ *is* the life of Christians,[7] or the life that *really* is.[8] In 10 passages only[9] has the word a temporal meaning, and of these two are quotations from the O.T.,[10] one is from Paul's discourse to Greeks,[11] one is rejected by the best texts,[12] and the rest merely use the popular term as required by the context. So that the general conclusion from the N.T. use of ζωή is that it stands for something definitely known as the prerogative of Christians, and indeed is almost a technical term. This conclusion is made more striking by the absolute use of the term in the Fourth Gospel, where it represents participation in Divine Being.[13]

[1] Of which seventeen are in the Fourth Gospel and six in the first Epistle of John.

[2] A mode of speech which is peculiar to none of the N.T. writers.

[3] Mark x. 30, Luke xviii. 30. [4] Acts v. 20.

[5] Rom. v. 10, vi. 23, 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11, 2 Tim. i. 1.

[6] Eph. iv. 18, Rev. xi. 11. [7] Col. iii. 4. [8] 1 Tim. vi. 19.

[9] Luke i. 75, xvi. 25, Acts viii. 33, xvii. 25, Rom. viii. 38, Phil. i. 20, Rev. xvi. 3, and Luke xii. 15, James iv. 14, 1 Peter iii. 10.

[10] Acts viii. 33 and 1 Peter iii. 10.

[11] Acts xvii. 25. [12] Luke i. 75.

[13] "In Him was Life," i. 4; "he shall not see Life," iii. 36; "the Father hath Life in Himself," v. 26; "the resurrection of Life," v. 29; "that ye may have Life," v. 40, x. 10; "giving Life to the world," vi. 33; "ye have not Life in yourselves," vi. 53; "the words are Life," vi. 63.

Now, if this description of the "unspeakable gift of God" in Christianity lie at the root of all that is written in the N.T.—and the use of ζωή or even of ζωὴ αἰώνιος is common to all N.T. writers—then we are justified in interpreting the phrases *Kingdom of God* in the Synoptics and *Faith* in St. Paul by it. *The Kingdom of God* is then something more than society as we know it, but purified from evil and made happy; it is something logically nearer to the universal than is denoted by the Talmudic idea of the reign or sovereignty of God. It is not so much earth raised to heaven as heaven come down to earth.[1] It is a Kingdom in which God is the King, but His Kingship consists not so much in the exercise of power or of moral governorship *ab extra* as in the inspiration to good behaviour *ab intra*. It is Life issuing in free obedience, but it is Life which determines conduct and not conduct Life.

The same conclusion is arrived at if we apply the conception of Life we have established to St. Paul's conception of *Faith*. God's *righteousness* is not the central conception of St. Paul's teaching. That place is reserved for *Faith*. For just as the O.T. righteousness sprang out of the conviction that God was King in Heaven and demanded obedience on earth, so in the N.T. a new kind of righteousness appears which is super-legal because it springs from a Life which is above the region

[1] "The world is energized by God. There are constantly streaming, as it were, down from heaven a number of currents which come straight from God" (Dr. Sanday in *The Journal of Theol. Studies*, July 1900, p. 484). The limitation to the natural contained in this passage seems to be removed a little later on when Dr. Sanday says: "This work of God within the soul . . . begins above in the highest heaven; it ends below in the hearts of men. It diffuses itself throughout the world. It passes from one soul to another."

where Law rules. That Life, the life of the living God, is not thought of now as enclosed in heavenly places. It has come down to earth and tabernacled among us, and we have been made partakers of it. What all N.T. writers call "aeonian life," or "the Life" as experienced, or what the Epistle of John calls having the Son, or the Fourth Evangelist calls "knowing the only true God," that St. Paul calls *Faith*. The fruit or manifestation of Faith is no doubt righteousness, or even the righteousness of God, but it is Faith which is primary. Just as the righteousness of God is what necessarily proceeds from the life of God, just as His Being is the norm of His activity, so the Christian's righteousness partakes of God's because it springs from that Faith which is the Life of God in the soul.[1]

We may see how the conception of Life harmonises St. Paul and the Synoptists if we apply it to their use of the term Faith.[2] The power of Faith to make men whole is due to its being deeper than intellectual belief, to its being actually Divine Life acting in the soul, and so overflowing to correct the aberrations of the bodily organism. The *Faith* which can move mountains is compared to a grain of mustard-seed, not because from small it becomes great, but because both are in different degrees endowed with *Life*. Over against Faith is set the intellectual process which consists in weighing pros

[1] In the interesting article of Dr. Sanday's just quoted this relation of *Faith* to *Life* and to the *Kingdom* is not set out at all, because it did not occur to Dr. Sanday to examine the phrase ζωὴ αἰώνιος and its variants in connection with the Synoptists' *Kingdom* and St. Paul's *righteousness*. It is the thought of the ζωή which acts as the unifying principle.

[2] The terms πίστις and its cognates share with πνεῦμα, χριστός, χάρις, ἀγάπη, and ἅγιος the honour of being the characteristic terms of the N.T. whether the analysis used be qualitative or quantitative.

and cons, and so arrives at a mediated conclusion which in its nature and mode of genesis is the antithesis of that immediate conviction called Faith.[1] When St. James says[2] that "the prayer of the Faith shall save" the sick man, he clearly means the prayer which has efficacy to quicken life because it proceeds from a principle of Life. And this agrees with the function of Faith in the healing of the sick as portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels.

The use of πιστεύειν by the Fourth Evangelist is to be compared with the phrase βαπτίζειν εἰς, for in both the central idea is that of an inner spiritual movement from a lower stage of life to a higher. To be baptized into Christ Jesus is to pass from outer existence, spent in marrying, getting on, fighting, and debating, into the inner life where are the springs of universal energy and joy whose giver is named Christ. Similarly the phrase πιστεύειν εἰς denotes the inner movement itself which consists in exchanging a lower desire for the higher desire, the world of form for the world of free and initiating and creative life. And it is just because the process so described transcends the categories of thought, and can be grasped only from within by "sympathetic imagination," or rather by actually experiencing it, that the phrase πιστεύειν εἰς can be rendered by a paraphrase only. A few examples may serve to make this clear.

[1] The verb διακρίνειν in Matt. xxi. 21 is wrongly translated to *doubt* or *disbelieve*. These may be the cause or the result of the process defined by the verb, but are not the process itself, and in some passages neither doubt nor disbelief is in question, *e.g.* Acts xi. 2, xv. 9, and the confusion seems responsible for the variant readings in Jude 22. To use modern language, what is commended is Intuition, and what is to be rejected, or used cautiously, is Reasoning.

[2] v. 15.

In John i. 13 the being born "of bloods," *i.e.* of such and such physical parentage, or "of the will of the flesh," *i.e.* of human institutions, as *e.g.* of an initiation of Isis, or "of the will of man," *i.e.* of the strong who seek after God, is opposed to the being born of God. But those who are born of God are also described as οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Θεοῦ, where the human correspondence with the divinely-bestowed birth is described. We might fully do justice to the phrase if we rendered it, "those who surrender themselves in desire and behaviour to God."

In John ii. 11 the rendering "His disciples believed in Him" fails to give the full meaning. That can hardly be that the disciples came to believe on Him because they saw the water turned into wine, for they were invited to the marriage because they were already His disciples. Nor is it meant that their belief was increased on seeing His glory. The full force of the declaration is obtained by taking the aorists in the gnomic sense, as it is to be done so often in this Gospel.[1] Then the full meaning of the verse is: "This mystic change of the life of the soul into the life of the Spirit, as the beginning and exemplar of the signs he comes to show, does Jesus continually perform in the free creative sphere,[2] and Thus He manifests His glory,

[1] "The meaning of past time which generally attaches itself to the aorist is lost in the case of the so-called *gnomic aorist* which has greater emphasis in a general statement than the present which is equally possible" (Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, p. 193). Blass quotes John xv. 6 as an instance, and says that this use of the aorist is very rare in the N.T. On the contrary, it is very common, as is readily seen when once the superstition is escaped from which exalts the historical at the expense of the mystical.

[2] Figured as Cana of Galilee, cf. Gen. xiv. 19, 22, Deut. xxxii. 6, Ps. cxxxix. 13.

and men become His disciples by seeing this glory, and by therefore coming to Him that they may have life."

The same mode of interpretation should be applied also to John ii. 23: "It is in Jerusalem, *i.e.* in the Church which has made its peace with the world, in the Passover, *i.e.* in the mystic process of passing from the sway of the visible order to that of the invisible, and in the earthly feast which shadows out the heavenly, that the first faint stirrings of desire are caused by reflection on the signs shown in word and deed, and many[1] are drawn to Him for His unspeakable gift of Life." In iii. 16 and vi. 40 the "believing on Him" and having "aeonian life" are connected as antecedent and consequent. In vi. 29 the work of God that is to be done is said to consist in "believing on Him whom He sends," while in vi. 35 the "believing on Him" is made strictly parallel to "coming to Him."

Of the remaining 98 passages in which the Fourth Evangelist uses the verb πιστεύω,[2] 27 show its absolute use; in 17 it is followed by the dative; in a few the verb is followed by ὅτι, and once by the accusative of the object. But the phrase which is most frequently used is the verb followed by εἰς, and this occurs 36 times. Moreover, a careful study of the 27 passages in which the absolute use is found will convince us that these should be added to the 36 which speak of "believing on."

It is certainly unfortunate that we have no verb in modern English cognate to the noun *faith*, for the want of it has led to the adoption of *believe* for

[1] Cf. vii. 31, viii. 30, x. 42, xi. 45, xii. 42, xvii. 8.

[2] He does not use the noun πίστις at all.

πιστεύειν, where the intellectual element tends to oust the moral or spiritual movement of Life. And it is just Life as distinct from the formulation of Life in Intellect which this verb stands for. Like the Hebrew הֶאֱמִין it denotes an act of the whole inner man which is strong in self-surrender to one who is strong. "The implication seems to be, not so much that of a passive dependence as of a vigorous active commitment. He who, in the Hebrew sense, exercises faith, is secure, assured, confident, and lays hold of the object of his confidence with firm trust." [1]

Faith, then, in the Christian sense is Life, and in particular "Life aeonian." But in saying that life aeonian is faith we have but substituted one term for another, one mechanical form for another mechanical form. And what we are dealing with is something which is the opposite of mechanism. On the other hand, all attempts to explain what life is must use dialectic, and dialectic is but logical mechanism. When this dialectic has done its utmost it still must confess that the pulsing, moving thing it set out to catch and hold fast and share with others has after all escaped, and all that it has succeeded in getting is a snapshot which gives but a fleeting aspect of the reality, and demands itself even to be reinterpreted back into the life impulse which created it. All that can be usefully said then may be said by pointing briefly to two outstanding expressions of Life, one contained in the

[1] Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, i. 827; Dr. Hastings himself quotes the Old English verb *trow* in a connection which would give us the verb we want. In Archbishop Hamilton's *Catechism*, xxv., it is said, "He that trowis and fermely beleiffis in the sone of God hais evirlastand lyfe, in this warld in hoip, and in the warld to cum in deid" (*ibid.* iv. 814). Cf. the first of the Middle-English Creeds given at the end of this volume.

philosophy of M. Bergson, and the other in the religious phenomenon known as Conversion.

A. We should miss the characteristic worth of M. Bergson's philosophy if we thought of it only as a reaction against the exaggerated Intellectualism of Kant, which undoubtedly it is. For it is much more. It is a reasoned attempt to carry further the critical work which Kant began when he overthrew the "dogmatism" of his rationalistic predecessors. The "criticism" of Kant took the form of an investigation of their theory of knowledge, and challenged their conclusions by denying the validity of their methods. His examination of our faculty of knowledge resulted in the two assertions that we know only phenomena, and not things in themselves, and that Experience alone gives knowledge—such knowledge being the product of the *matter* of experience, and the *form* of the understanding.

Now Bergson may be said to take up the problem of philosophy where Kant and his disciples laid it down. He applies to the *matter* of experience a science of Nature which both in its sweep and mastery of detail was beyond the reach of Kant, and he brings to the analysis of the *form* of the understanding a conception [1] which, though not alien to the *Kritik of the Practical Reason*, is rather latent in it than fully expressed. Blending in a sense both Kant and Schopenhauer, as Kant himself had endeavoured to harmonise his predecessors, he collocates the Thought of the former with the Will of the latter by referring them both to a more fundamental activity, the activity known as Life.

[1] Or shall we say an intuition?

We are thus supplied with a new antithesis, viz. that between Life and Intellect where Intellect is merely instrumental and Life is the Dictator at once using Intellect and being thwarted by it. Our intellect " is only a motionless and fragmentary view of life which naturally takes its stand outside of time. Life, on the contrary, progresses and *endures* in time." [1] Intelligence enlightens action, but in order to do this effectually it adopts the rhythm of action, and as action is discontinuous so, too, does knowledge become. But Life is continuous; it has duration; the past is wholly in the present, and is always gnawing into the future. There is, therefore, a fatal chasm between Life and Intellect, and all that the latter can do is to give us snapshots, cinematograph views of the movement of Life which is thus split up into fragments, while Life is the continuous Reality between the fragments and in them. Intellect, therefore, by itself can never give us the Real; it can only subserve the practical needs of our lives. On the other hand, " in order to advance with the moving reality you must replace yourself within it. Install yourself within change, and you will grasp at once both change itself and the successive states in which it might at any instant be immobilized." [2]

What Bergson puts into the place of Intellect as the guide to Life is what he calls Intuition, defined as " instinct that has become disinterested, self-conscious, capable of reflecting upon its object, and of enlarging it indefinitely." And again: " Intuition may bring the intellect to recognise that life does not quite go into the category of the many

[1] *Creative Evolution*, p. 54. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 324-5.

nor yet into that of the one ; that neither mechanical causality nor finality can give a sufficient interpretation of the vital process. Then, by the sympathetic communication which it establishes between us and the rest of the living, by the expansion of our consciousness which it brings about, it introduces us into Life's own domain, which is reciprocal interpenetration, endlessly continued creation." [1]

What M. Bergson calls " sympathetic communication," the " tension " which enters into another's mind through sympathy,[2] " divining sympathy," [3] Christianity calls *Love*, and in opposition to scholasticism *mysticism*.[4] But love, or the mystic temperament, springs from the depths,[5] is free, subject to no constraint, not to be confined by formulae, stronger than death, drawing its reserves from the superior world in which our consciousness finds itself bathed, and, therefore, creating its environment and moulding its opportunities rather than being moulded by them, or even *replying* to them, though that, too, it often freely does.

B. Conversion is a moment in the aeonian life

[1] *Creative Evolution*, pp. 186, 187.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 220. [3] *Ibid.* p. 185.

[4] Cf. Récéjac, *Bases of the Mystic Knowledge*, p. 7 : " Mysticism claims to be able to know the Unknowable without help from dialectics, and is persuaded that by means of love and will, it reaches a point to which thought unaided cannot attain." There is too almost a ring of Bergson in his concluding remarks, p. 287 : " Since it is our condition of ' free-being ' which creates in us the evident excess of Desire over the Intelligence, there must also be in Freedom reserves of the spiritual to re-establish the balance ; otherwise we should sin, we alone in the Universe would be sinful in our very essence. To these priceless reserve forces we have given the name of Inspiration. The Absolute eludes the Consciousness, but the Good fills it completely. We need only to love it, and the truth of Pascal's sentence is fulfilled, ' God known of the heart.' " Cf. Rudolf Eucken, *The Meaning and Value of Life*, p. 83.

[5] Or the heights.

which does not differ in kind from that which begins immediately after death or that which follows the resurrection of the body, whatever Dr. Briggs may say to the contrary. Indeed it is a pure assumption that the spiritual, or aeonian life, differs essentially in its different stages, and neither Dr. Briggs nor anybody else is able to point to any difference made in the Bible between the life of the Christian here and his life hereafter, except of a negative character. The life is the same throughout essentially, though in heaven it is freed from the evils which dog it here. This life is shed abroad in our hearts by a Divine spirit;[1] it is hid now with Christ in God;[2] it is identical with God's Spirit dwelling in us,[3] and this Spirit is the earnest of a better state to come, and the guarantee that our bodies from being mortal shall become immortal. So clear is this unbroken continuity of aeonian life that it would never have occurred to a learned Professor to question it if he had not first been misled by a current perversion of Christian teaching which has first substituted static, ecclesiastical ordinances for dynamic, spiritual experience, and then followed blindly the Judaic thought which set in opposition "this world" and "that world."

But the case is clear enough when once we follow Carlyle's advice and "clear our minds of cant." The whole appeal of Jesus Christ was on behalf of Life as against the ecclesiastical forms of His day which choked its free passage. Assuredly it was not doctrine that He came to give, though He taught with more authority than Stoic, Orphic, or Rabbinical teacher. It was not works of wonder that He performed in order to startle men into

[1] Rom. v. 5. [2] Col. iii. 3. [3] Rom. viii. 9.

submission—He who resisted in the Wilderness as a presumptuous sin the suggestion that He should work a miracle by leaping from the Temple-height, and stigmatised as an evil and adulterous generation the people who sought after a sign. He as little cared as the Buddha before Him for metaphysics, so that what He abstained from saying seems as remarkable as what He did say. Discussions about the Absolute, about Personal Identity, the Supreme Good and the Moral Criterion, about the Self and the Soul, about unity and multiplicity, Pluralism and Theism, intellectualism and voluntarism are all alien to His methods. And yet His silence is hardly that of ignorance, but of fulness of knowledge acquired and deliberately renounced as useless for His purpose. What in others raised intellectual enquiry for Him was a sign-post pointing to God.[1] Or out of what others used for self-glorification He drew a moral stimulus.[2] The tower of Siloam, like the man born blind, and analogously all other events were stimuli to the Practical Reason alone.

For the religion of Jesus Christ is a religion based on experience and leading to it. It is found in the individual, but is not confined to him. For what is given in one man's experience is similarly given also in another's, and may be given in that of everybody. All healthy mysticism is the very reverse of Solipsism,[3] even though it do maintain that "a man in himself alone is worth the whole order of empirical things." For mysticism is but the religious man's assertion of the free, creative,

[1] John ix. 3. [2] Luke xiii. 4.

[3] "The doctrine that all existence is experience, and that there is only one experient. The Solipsist thinks that he is the one." But as it is matter of daily knowledge that individual consciousnesses report the same content solipsism is transcended, that is, it is at best a fragmentary truth.

and unique character of that "indivisible unity which forms for us that 'direct sense of self' in which Lotze rightly places the positive essence of personality."[1] But at the same time this assertion, while affirming that each man's experience is for himself, goes on to add that the individual as being for himself is but an abstraction. As a concrete thing he is a member of a larger system of similarly free creative beings, and there is common to all these beings that they are "fundamental differentiations of the Absolute." Hence while "the mystic fact consists in relations between the Absolute and Freedom which are incommunicable,[2] yet this incommunicability is qualified by the fact that all these 'differentiations' are 'for the unity,' and possess, therefore, a common ground which in its turn gives a common similarity of experience. And it is this community of experience, in special of mystic experience, which establishes the fellowship of mystics, the City of God."[3]

Indeed, it would be hardly an exaggeration to say that the mystic experience is essentially the bursting the bonds of self-hood by the effective revelation to the soul of a larger social order of spirits. The Self which was before content to be

[1] McTaggart, *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*, 1901, p. 83.

[2] Récéjac, *The Bases of the Mystic Knowledge*, 1889, p. 143.

[3] The failure to allow place here and now for this "Christian Socialism" is the principal blot on Récéjac's otherwise admirable work. "No social part," he says (p. 261), "can be assigned to mystic symbolism. In default, however, of common symbols, a universal, and in some sort religious object must be presented to souls capable of social aspirations, this object is Freedom itself, which renders us susceptible to Mysticism and guarantees its purity." He insists rightly enough on the integration of souls in the Absolute and bids us desire the fulfilment of this integration out of Time, but he does not see the impossibility of bridging over the gap between the Timeless and Time unless the integration to be fulfilled in the former has at any rate begun in Time. Mysticism must be building already a Mystic City.

for itself now discovers that it is part of a social order which in its turn is of a universal character, and so it loses itself to find itself. Outwardly this is called Conversion, inwardly Regeneration. The personal identity remains; there remains also an identity of attributes, by virtue of a "permanent element which persists all through change," but the change which takes place in Conversion consists in the bringing to the surface of elements which before were secondary, or even quiescent and unrecognised, especially elements which are themselves syntheses of other more partial elements. And the process when regarded from its inner side, or that of Regeneration, is a particular case of Epigenesis, defined as "a causative impulse to a new and more complex state." We may, if we choose, say that all Regeneration is in accordance with Law, a proposition which means only that we prefer to deal with it under the lower category of Law instead of the higher category of Life. If we use this latter, then we shall affirm that the Life which was being kept back while the smaller Self was dominant has now broken through its barriers, and, while using the materials provided by that smaller Self, is building up a more complex organism with more extended relations to the outside world.

The power which does this has appeared in history as Christianity, that is, as the power of God energising in Jesus Christ and in His followers. As a religious force, therefore, Christianity is most precisely expressed in Regeneration and its consequences, and only indirectly in institutional forms. These latter have the relative value of supplying the materials out of which the Christian consciousness constructs its Not-self, but the Life

of the Christ is the permanent, formative, and self-determining element which may be called the *Ego* of the Church. As such it is the ground of the identity of the Christian, and the guarantee that while he evolves, that is, uniformly progresses and changes, he yet remains the same. In short, it is the ζωὴ αἰώνιος which at once ennobles, enriches, continues, and unifies our being. The suggestion that the mode of our life here is one, that in the intermediate state another, and that after the general resurrection a third, is tenable only on the supposition that they are interconnected stages in one continuous evolution. But in that case this is but saying that the ζωὴ αἰώνιος of the final stage is identical with that which as Christians we experience already here.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE TITLE "THE SON OF MAN"

Reference has been made so often in the preceding pages to the dependence of Christian thought on previous "Gnostic" thought that it seems desirable to ask at some length whether the reference is not justified by the remarkable title "Son of Man" applied to Jesus by the first three Evangelists. It will appear, if the facts to be adduced directly are rightly estimated, that the title is not derivable from Jewish sources but is borrowed from Hellenism.

The origin and the meaning of the title "*Son of Man*" remain still an unsolved problem. Its origin has been referred to Ezekiel, to Daniel, to the Book of Enoch, to unexplored apocalyptic societies. It has been held, now to veil, now to reveal the personality of Him to whom it is applied. It has been held to be a title. It has been denied to be anything more than a description. It represents the ideal man; a prophetic man; man in the body of his humiliation; the superhuman Being who was to end this dispensation; it is the representative man; or it is a bald synonym for "man"; or a surrogate for the first personal pronoun.

This Note is intended to draw attention to a neglected factor which seems capable of accounting for many of the difficulties which surround the subject.

Excluding parallels, the title occurs 39 times in the Synoptic Gospels and 11 times in the Fourth Gospel (omitting v. 27).[1] In the Synoptics twelve passages are found in connection with the sufferings and betrayal of Jesus; nineteen refer to the Last Things (or to the treatment awaiting His disciples); eight describe the authority, behaviour, or condition of the

[1] The passages are tabulated in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii. p. 579.

"Son of Man." The largest group, it will be seen, is that which relates to eschatology. Further, it is certain that in some cases (*e.g.* Matt. xvi. 13) the phrase is a paraphrase for the pronoun, and is so probably in many more. The inference, therefore, is that the title was introduced from regions of speculation and not of history, came down from above and determined what was below, and not *vice versa*.

This inference is supported by a little reflection on the nature of the historical antecedents of the title, as well as by its actual use in the New Testament, and also by the limitations on its use revealed in the early Christian literature.

The use of the title in Ezekiel is not relevant, for there it denotes merely man as distinct from a higher being, as the man to whom revelation comes over against the angel through whom the revelation is made.

In Daniel vii. 13, the term is clearly no title, and the Messianic interpretation of later days is read into it, not out of it.

In the Book of Enoch (xlvi. 2, 3, xlviii. 2, lxii. 5, 7, lxix. 26, 27, 29) the term occurs, but even here not as a title, even though the step towards making it a title may be a short one. Moreover, it is not certain that the passages referred to have not been coloured by Christian modifications of the text.

In 4 Ezra xiii. 25, 32, 37, we have merely a reflection of the passage in Daniel.

There is little historical ground, therefore, for the supposition that the phrase "*Son of Man*" was a Messianic title in common use before the appearance of Jesus Christ.

Did He use it of Himself, or has it been borrowed by the Evangelists, or introduced into their writings by later scribes?

Further, are we free to assume that the meaning of the title in the Fourth Gospel is determinative for its meaning in the other three? In that Gospel it bears demonstrably the meaning of one—any one—who has been born again into eternal, *i.e.* spiritual, life.

Two difficulties confront us as soon as we attempt to frame any answer to these questions.

One is that according to the almost unanimous consensus of scholars Jesus spoke ordinarily in Aramaic, not Greek, and that in the Aramaic bar-nâshâ (=*homo, Mensch*) the force of the *bar* (son) has been lost, so that *Son of Man* would mean merely *man*.

The second difficulty is that the phrase "*Son of Man*" is

not applied to Jesus in the N.T. anywhere outside the Gospels, except in Acts vii. 56, and there it is hardly possible to regard its use as historical. Nor is it found in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, in the *Letter of Clement*, in the *Homily of Clement*, in the *Didache*, in *Polycarp's Letter*, or in the *Epistles of Ignatius*. On the supposition that Jesus used the title of Himself as either a veil or a revelation of His Messianic character such silence is inexplicable, and the more so when its use would seem in some cases to be called for by the context, if it were a current title at all (as, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. xv.).

If, then, the title is not derivable from the Aramaic we are referred to the Greek, and in this case we are bound to give more weight than is ordinarily given to the fact that the Greek phrase is uniformly "the Son of *the* Man." What is the bearing of the second definite article here? It is not a translation from Hebrew, Aramaic, or Ethiopic. Is it as colourless as the *bar* in bar-nâshâ, or is it to be construed literally? The latter question, it is suggested, should be answered in the affirmative, and when the records of the Gnostic teachers are brought into the witness-box it seems certain that not only must the question be answered in the affirmative, but that the Gnostic interpretation must be regarded as determinative. In that case we may have to face the further question whether if Gnostic influences be traceable in moulding the use of the title "Son of Man," the same influences may not have to be admitted in the development of other Christian terms.

Our principal knowledge of Gnosticism, it is true, is derived from the description of their "systems" given us by their opponents, notably by Irenaeus and Hippolytus. But what we have is a fragment only of what once existed, and we may further assume without much hazard that what these Fathers give us is but the corpse out of which the life has gone. Did we know Gnosticism as a living force we should probably find that it was as much religious as philosophic, and that we do it wrong when we treat it merely as a "system" more or less unintelligible or bizarre.

Looking at it in the mass we may say that it was an amalgam of speculations, with wide differences in detail, but bearing the impress of a philosophy of dualism in some sort, expressing itself in the main in the doctrine that man had descended into the tomb of the body from the world above, and had been

engaged ever since in escaping from his prison that he might wend his way back to his home.

These speculations were of earlier origin than the first century of our era, and were not born, therefore, within the Catholic Church. They should be regarded rather as forming a part, and a most important part, of that environment in which the Catholic Church herself was born, and as helping to mould her thought, her creeds, and her institutions. In the last analysis they appear as Oriental cults in a Greek dress.

" The cultured," says Harnack, " were in search of a religion, that is, a firm basis for the results of their speculations, and they hoped to obtain it by turning themselves towards the very old Oriental cults, and seeking to fill them with the religious and moral knowledge which had been gained by the schools of Plato and of Zeno. The union of the traditions and rites of the Oriental traditions, viewed as mysteries, with the spirit of Greek philosophy is the characteristic of the epoch." [1]

And again : " The great Hellenic Gnostic schools arose spontaneously, in the sense of having been independently developed out of the elements to which undoubtedly the Asiatic cults also belonged, without being influenced in any way by Syrian syncretistic efforts." [2]

The appearance of Gnosticism on the scene antedated our Gospels, for " long before the appearance of Christianity combinations of religion had taken place in Syria and Palestine, especially in Samaria, in so far, on the one hand, as the Assyrian and Babylonian religion, with its manifold interpretations, had penetrated as far as the Eastern Shore of the Mediterranean, and been accepted even by the Jews, and on the other hand, the Jewish Messianic idea had spread and called forth various movements." [3]

According to Mr. C. W. King : " The Ophites first assumed a definite existence about the same time as the Basilidians, in the middle of the second century, although the elements of the doctrine are derived from a source much more remote. That source was the secret doctrines taught in the various Pagan Mysteries ; and likewise certain philosophic theories of the Greeks." [4]

In order to show the prevalence of the conception in Gnostic

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. 229. [2] *Ibid.* i. 248.
[3] *Ibid.* i. 244. [4] *The Gnostics and their Remains*, p. 82.

circles of the title "*Son of Man*" it will be necessary to give quotations at some length from Gnostic writers. It will be seen from them how audacious and magnificent was their thought that the unity of the Universe required that God should be akin to Man, that the first manifestation of the Eternal was *Man*, and the Second was the *Son of Man*.

Hippolytus in describing the system of the Naasenes says that "the foundation of their doctrine is the man *Adam* who was the Man brought forth by the earth spontaneously; but he lay without breath, without motion, without stirring, like a statue, being made after the image of their Adamas above. . . . The man that is above is of both sexes. 'From what vast happiness, what height of glory,' then, have we fallen, from the Primal Man, the *Adamas* that is above, into this vessel of clay and become the servants of the Demiurgus, of Ildabaoth, the God of Fire, the Fourth in number. . . . Yet it is the Christ that is figured in all the sons of men by the unfigured Logos. This is the great and profound mystery of the Eleusinian rites, the cry—'UE, KUE, *Rain, Conceive.*' . . . Homer speaks of souls like bats falling from their chain, that is, the souls fallen from the Rock above, namely, from the Adamas. This is the Adamas, the chief corner-stone, 'which is made the head of the corner,' because in the head is placed the formative substance, the brain out of which all generation proceeds. 'I will set the Adamant in the foundations of Zion' is allegorical for setting the figure of the Man (in the soul). And in the text, 'This Adamas is firmly held by teeth in the wall,' it is the Inner Man that is signified, the 'stone cut without hands' which hath fallen down from the Adamas above into this earthly potter's vessel, this figure of forgetfulness."[1]

"Here likewise is the unspeakable secret of the Samothracian Mysteries which none but we, the 'perfect,' are able to understand, for the Samothracians expressly mention the Adamas who is above—the Primal Man. For in the temple of the Samothracians stand two naked men; . . . these two statues represent the Primal Man and the Spiritual Man after he is 'born again and made like unto him every whit.'"[2]

"The Knowledge of the Perfect Man is very deep and hard to be attained to. The beginning of perfection is the Knowledge of man, but absolute perfection is the Knowledge of GOD. He

[1] *Refutation of all Her.* bk. v. ch. 2. [2] *Ibid.* v. ch. 3.

(Adamas) is designated by the Phrygians as 'the Green Wheat-ear cut off'; on this account, at the Eleusinian rites, the initiated hold up in silence to the Directors the wondrous mystery, the green ear of wheat. This wheat-ear is the Perfect Son descended from the Adamas above, the great Giver of light, like the Hierophant himself."[1]

"These [Naaseni], then, . . . magnify . . . a man and a *Son of Man*. . . . And, they say, of this man one part is rational, another psychical, another earthly. And they suppose that the knowledge of him is the originating principle of the capacity for a knowledge of God, expressing themselves thus: 'the originating principle of perfection is the knowledge of man, while the knowledge of God is absolute perfection.' All these qualities, however, rational and psychical and earthly, have . . . descended into one man simultaneously—Jesus, who was born of Mary. And these three men are . . . in the habit of speaking [through Jesus] at the same time together. For . . . there are three kinds of existent things—angelic, psychical, earthly; and there are three churches—angelic, psychical, earthly; and the names of these are *elect, called, captive*."[2]

The character, then, of the *Man* who occupies the second place in the Naasene system is that of the Primal Man descending into matter and then laboriously ascending to where he was before. "The Thracians call Him Corybas, because He has come down from above" from the formless One, and has passed through all the lower worlds without their inhabitants knowing it. . . . "He is in this material world and nobody knows it." He sits upon the many water-floods of the generation of mortal men [Ps. xxix. 10], and His voice is heard as He cries from the midst of them to the unfigured Man above. His is the cry of Ps. xxxv. 17, "Deliver my soul from the lion," and to Him is the promise of Isaiah (xli. 8 and xliii. 1): "Thou art my Servant, Israel; fear not; when thou passest through the waters I will be with thee." Psalm xxiv. describes the Ascension of the Primal Man after His descent. And the word of the Fourth Gospel, "I am the door," is the word of "the Perfect Man, figured in manifestation, who has come from the Unfigured Man above."[3]

---

[1] *Refutation of all Her.* v. ch. 3.
[2] Hippolytus, *Ref.* v. 1.
[3] *Ibid.* v. 3.

The testimony of Irenaeus concerning the Ophites is similar. They taught according to him that in the Unutterable Depth were two great Lights, the First Man, or Father, and His Son, the Second Man; and also the Holy Spirit, the First Woman, or Mother of all living. . . . The *Universal* Mother brooded over the waters; enamoured of her beauty the First and Second Man produced from her the third Great Light, the Christ; and He, ascending above, formed with the First and Second Man the Holy Church. . . . But a Drop of Light fell downwards to the left hand into chaotic matter; this was called Sophia, or Wisdom, the *World-Mother*. . . . Her mere contact with the Space-Waters had already generated a son, the chief Creative Power of the Sensible World, Ialdabaoth. . . . And Ialdabaoth was boastful and arrogant, and exclaimed: "I am Father and God, and beyond me is none other." But Sophia hearing this cried out to her son: "Lie not, Ialdabaoth, for above Thee is the Father of all, the First Man, and Man, the *Son of Man*." [1]

So of another and little known sect Hippolytus says: "The followers of Monoimus, the Arabian, assert that the originating principle of the universe is a primal man and *son of man*, and that as Moses states, the things that have been produced were produced, not by the primal man, but by the Son of that primal man, and not by the entire Son, but by a part of Him. And Monoimus asserts that *Son of Man* is iota, which stands for ten . . . through which the generation of the world consists. . . . Inasmuch as what is perfect emanates from what is perfect . . . whatsoever things the man possesses the Father of the *Son of Man* possesses also." [2]

In the Koptic Gospel of Mary the highest Godhead has also the name *Primal Man*. "This is the Pentad of the Aeons of the Father, *i.e.* of the *Primal Man*." Also of the figure of Barbelo standing near the *Primal Man* it is said: "she became *Primal Man*"; or the female counterpart of the male primal being. For in this system it is said of the primal Father: "He thinks His image and sees it in the pure water of Light which surrounds Him." That Image of the Invisible is called Barbelo.

According to another account [Iren. i. 29. 3], from Barbelo and the Primal Man proceed Logos and Ennoia, from these

---

[1] *Heresies*, i. 30. [2] Hippolytus, *Refutation of all Her.* x. 13.

Autogenes and Aletheia, from these the perfect and true Man whom they call *Adamas*, to whom is given as partner the *perfect Gnosis*.[1]

In Irenaeus [i. 29 and 30] the Barbelo-Gnostics have a Trinity: Father, Ennoia, and Christ; or Father, Barbelo, and Christ, where the title *Christ* has ousted the title *Man*. A surrogate for the *Man* was with some the fallen Sophia, and then the Christ, instead of being a name for the *Man* descended into matter, becomes the Saviour who voluntarily descends into matter to rescue out of it the already fallen Sophia; and comparison of this scheme with that of the Naasenes as given by Hippolytus makes clear the conception common to both systems and their characteristic variations.[2]

Clement of Alexandria preserves a genuine fragment from a letter of Valentinus in which it is said that Adam, created in the name of "*the Man*," had struck fear into the demons before "the pre-existing Man." [3]

So in Epiphanius (*Panar*, 31. 5) it is said that the Father of Truth bore also the mystical name "*Man*": "The Perfect named Him in a familiar way "*Man*" because He was an antitype of the pre-existing Unbegotten." [4]

But in another passage of Irenaeus "*the Man*" is a title given to the Highest [i. 12. 4]: "Others however say that the Primal Father of all things is called '*Man*,' and that this is the great and hidden mystery, that the Power which is over all things and is the creative source of all things is called '*Man*.'" [5]

In the *Pistis Sophia* Jeû is called the "*first Man*." The place in which He is, is almost highest, far above that of the first "command." The souls must pass through all places before they reach the Great Man, *i.e.* to the King of this whole Light-treasury whose name is Jeû [318, 35 ff.]. "When He sees that the disciples have done all His works Jeû the Father of the Light-treasury will rejoice over you, will give you each His mystery, His seal, and the great Name of the Light-treasury." [6]

An echo of this conception of the *Man* descending into matter meets us in the Apocryphal Acts of the Martyrdom of Peter: "The Primal Man having been introduced by the head

---

[1] Bousset, *Die Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 160, 161.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 162.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 163.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 164.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 165.
[6] Schmidt, *Koptische Schriften*, pp. 185, 4; 208, 2; 215, 29, 30.

brought to light the generation that before was not, for it was dead, having no motion. Having then been brought down, He established the whole of the cosmic order." As, then, the Primal Man had, as it were, come down into matter head-first, so Peter is represented as desirous of imitating Him symbolically by being crucified head-downwards.[1]

From the above we may infer that the Gnostics built on the maxim: "As below so above." They first regarded man as a celestial being who has descended into matter, and then transferred his title to the *Primal Man*, the Son of the Supreme Being whose descent into matter and his ascent out of matter form the subject of the world-drama. From the Son the title was then transferred to the Supreme Being Himself, "the Unfigured," who becomes thus in accordance with the same maxim "the Adam above."

In the Manichean system the *Primal Man* occupies a leading place. According to the Fihrist, God, the King of Paradise, together with the Spirit of His right-hand, with His five worlds and His twelve Elements, begot a Creature who is the Eternal *Man* and summoned Him to His aid in a war against the Darkness.[2]

The same Trinity of Father-Mother-Son appears in another account of the same act. "The Great Father," according to this account, "created the Mother of Life; she created the *Primal Man* and He five sons."[3]

It is next told of the *Primal Man* that He armed Himself for the fight with Matter with His five elements [=His five sons], the gentle Breeze, the burning Light, the Water, the raging Wind, the Fire, and with these encountered the Prince of Darkness with His five sons. Being worsted in the encounter He lost a part of His armour.[4]

In some Greek writers the Primal Man is called "the soul of all things" [*Titus von Bosra*, i. 29], and this World-soul is mixed with Matter and so subject to birth and death. The *Primal Man* being thus imprisoned in the Abyss the Spirit of Life with His fellows looked down on Him and cried aloud as quickly as lightning and the *Primal Man* became another God. The Spirit of Life then stretched forth His hand to the *Primal Man* and drew Him out of the darkness. The Elements,

[1] *Acta apost.* ed. Bonnet, i. 90.
[2] Flügel, *Mani.* p. 87.
[3] Theodor Bar-Kuni, in *Pognon*, p. 185.
[4] Flügel, *ut supra.*

however, which have formed His accoutrements remained in the power of darkness, and these Elements form the World-soul. Their finest parts were formed into the Sun and Moon and in them the Saviour in the Manichean system had His principal dwelling. Their Saviour finally was identified with the Christ of Christian faith.[1]

In the Greek Hermetic literature a similar conception of the humanity of God is found. In Poimander the Highest God is called Nous, a male-female Being. He begets a second Nous, Demiourgos, a God of Fire, who in His turn begets seven Dioiketai, who span with their circles the whole sensible world. Then the Highest Father of All begets as His last emanation the *Man*. He bears His Father's form, and to Him are committed all His Father's works. This *Man* having beheld the World of the Demiurge, longs to imitate it, inclines to Nature, sees His own image in the water, falls in love with it, and resolves to abide there. Thus Nature captured the *Man* and they became one. From this union of the heavenly and the earthly arose earthly man, at once mortal and immortal, under the power of Fate and superior to it.[2]

According to Hippolytus, the Gnostics borrowed their doctrine of the Primal Man from the mysteries of Attis. Attis, who scorning the love of the Mother of the Gods, turned to the nymphs and through love to them set the world-process in motion, is the Primal Man and is specifically called *Adamas*. The Gnostic doctrine of the *Primal Man* then seems to go back to Phrygia, where Attis, the Primal Man, and Kybele, the Great Mother, were worshipped.

Also in the unknown Gnostic work of Schmidt is mention made of the "incomprehensible Man" and of the bodiless members from which He is formed—the *Man* whom the whole universe prays to learn to know.[3]

Zosimus declares that the *Primal Man* in the sacred Egyptian writings is called Thoth, and that the Chaldaeans, Parthians, Medes, and Hebrews called Him Adam, his second name is Light, and His hidden name no one knows but the unsearchable Nikotheos.[4]

---

[1] C. F. Baur, *Das manich. Religionssystem*, 214.
[2] Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, p. 328 ff.
[3] Schmidt, *Kopt.-gnostische Schriften*, p. 336.
[4] Reitzenstein, *ibid.* p. 103.

Philo's contrast[1] between the Ideal man and the *Adam* of Genesis shows that the later glorification of the latter is probably due to a clothing of him with the attributes of the former. The one is of soul and body, man or woman, mortal; the other is the idea, the genus, the seal, belongs to the spirit-world, neither man nor woman. As with the Clementines so with Philo, the heavenly man is incarnated in the earthly Adam, Enoch, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and lastly in Christ, and a proof of His presence is the wisdom which enabled Adam to give the animals names.

"There are two races of men," says Philo again, "the one made after the Image and the one formed out of the earth."[2] "Men should be at peace one with another," he says in another place [§ 41] "because they are enrolled after one and the same Father, who is not mortal but immortal, *Man Divine*, being of eternity and of necessity the Word, and incorruptible.[3]

From the above cursory survey the following conclusions may be drawn:

(1) That in important Gnostic circles the *Primal Man* occupied a prominent place as a Divine Being, and that the evidence for His worth that we have is but a small portion of what once existed.

(2) That He was the third member of the Trinity of Father, Mother, Son.

(3) That His principal function is that of the Divine descending into the Kosmos and dispersing His Light through Matter in order to collect it again and restore it to its source.

(4) His work is therefore dual—to give Soul to the world and to restore Soul to Spirit. In this latter capacity He becomes Saviour or Redeemer.

(5) That in orthodox Judaism of the last two centuries B.C.

---

[1] *De opificio mundi*, 134-144, 148-150.

[2] *Legum alleg.* § 53. Cf. *De conf. ling.* § 11 (411 M.).

[3] An "undesigned coincidence" of the main Gnostic concept occurs in an unexpected quarter, in the writings of that whimsical genius Mr. G. K. Chesterton. In *Heretics*, p. 152, is the following passage:

"As long as a tree is a tree, it is a top-heavy monster with a hundred arms, a thousand tongues and only one leg. But so long as a tree is a tree, it does not frighten us at all. It begins to be something alien, to be strange, only when it looks like ourselves. When a tree really looks like a man our knees knock under us. And when the whole universe looks like a man we fall on our faces."

this Redeeming Being took form as the Messiah, the World-judge, His rôle as World-former being neglected.

(6) That in Christian circles afterwards this Redeeming Divine-man was identified with Jesus of Nazareth and the characteristic qualities of the one were transferred to the other and bestowed on Him as clothing.

(7) That hence the title *the Son of the Man* as applied to Jesus of Nazareth in the Synoptic Gospels marks a stage in Christian reflection when the Jesus Christ of history is enlarged to the stature of the Primal Man of Gnostic speculation.

(8) And that hence it follows that the title *the Son of the Man* was first applied in the Synoptics in an eschatological sense, and was only afterwards extended to the *Man* as suffering, or as teaching, wandering about, or living as do other men.

(9) And further that the eschatological sayings about the *Son of the Man* must be regarded as either not genuine words of Jesus, or if uttered by him, must refer either to a manifestation of the *Second God* in an undefined form, or in His own form as distinct from the personality informing it.

(10) And lastly (on the supposition that *Son of Man* is of Gnostic origin), that the title was taken over by Christians before Catholicism and Gnosticism had become hostile to one another; or, in the alternative, by such a compromise as may be seen in the admission of the Fourth Gospel into the Canon. In the latter case we may expect a certain amount of re-editing of the documents, and of this re-editing indeed considerable traces may still be discerned in all Four Gospels. In either case, the possibility is left open for the suspicion that more of Gnostic doctrines lie hidden in our canonical writings than is ordinarily supposed.

To which may be added:

(1) That the Gnostic speculation was based on the Orphic principle, "As above so below." The mixture of good and evil in the world and in man represented a prior process of mingling in the heavenly world, *the Son of the Man* being their Name for the Good in all things which is in process of being freed from its admixture of good and evil; and

(2) That the veneration paid in Catholic circles with growing intensity to the Son and also to the Mother has its parallel in the Gnostic regard for the Heavenly Mother, the Barbelo, Ennoia, Heavenly Sophia, side by side with that for the Son, the Second God, the Primal Man.

APPENDIX

SOME FORMS OF THE CREED

That the Creed as a *regula* or *lex* grew out of the Confession of Faith made by the Catechumen at Baptism, and out of the μάθημα, or teaching, which was an expansion of that Confession, is generally acknowledged. And it is only necessary, therefore, to state the successive forms taken by the Creed as it gradually developed itself into our present Apostles' Creed.

The earliest Confession of Faith was in Jesus as the Son of God. This occurs in the spurious verse, Acts viii. 37 : "Then Philip said, 'If thou believest with thy whole heart it is permitted.' Then in reply he said :

'*I believe that the Son of God is Jesus Christ.*' "

This Confession of Faith, though an interpolation in the *Acts of the App.*, is yet a testimony to the practice at the time when the interpolation was made.

It was a later, though natural, and, all things considered, a necessary development when belief in the Trinity was demanded of the candidate in place of belief in Jesus. And we may conjecture that the material cause in bringing about the change was the influence of Gnostic thought. Though authorities are looking for the precise form that the Trinitarian Confession took on its first appearance, the following is perhaps very near to it :

I believe in God, Father ; and in Christ Jesus, the Son after the Spirit, our Lord, who was crucified and rose and sitteth at God's right hand, whence He cometh to judge. And I believe in Holy Spirit.

The actual content of such a form would be supplemented by oral instruction just as the Apostles' Creed supplements it by incorporating additional clauses as explicatory notes.

We are on surer ground when we come to the *Old Roman Symbol*, composed in Rome about the middle of the second century, written in Greek, and probably called forth by the teaching of Marcion. It ran thus :

Πιστεύω εἰς Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα· καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν, τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, τὸν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρός, ὅθεν ἔρχεται κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· καὶ εἰς Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν, ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν.

In English this would run :

I believe in God the Father Almighty ; and in Christ Jesus, His only-begotten son, our Lord, who was born of Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried, on the third day rose from the dead, ascended into the heavens, sitteth at the right hand of the Father, whence He cometh to judge quick and dead ; and in Holy Spirit, holy Church, remission of sins, resurrection of flesh.

And in German :

Ich glaube an Gott den Vater, Allmächtigen ; und an Christus Jesus seinen eingeborenen Sohn, unseren Herrn, der geboren ist aus heiligem Geist und Maria der Jungfrau, der unter Pontius Pilatus gekreuzigt und begraben ist, am dritten Tage auferstanden von den Toten, aufgefahren in die Himmel, sich setzend zur Rechten des Vaters, woher er kommt zu richten Lebendige und Tote, und an heiligen Geist, heilige Kirche, Vergebung der Sünden, Fleisches Auferstehung.

The Latin form runs :

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem ; et in Jesum Christum filium eius unicum, Dominum nostrum qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine, sub Pontio Pilato

crucifixus et sepultus, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in coelum, sedet ad dextram Patris, inde venturus iudicare vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Sanctam Ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem.

This Symbol has a very interesting history. In the first place, it became about the fourth century the subject of the legend that its name *Apostles' Creed* was due to the fact that the Apostles met on the day of Pentecost and contributed each an article before starting on their missionary work.[1]

Thus Peter said: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth";

Andrew said: "And in Jesus Christ His only-begotten Son, our Lord";

James said: "Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary";

John said: "Suffered under Pontius Pilate, crucified, dead and buried";

Thomas said: "He descended into Hell, on the third day rose again from the dead";

James said: "He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty";

Philip said: "From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead";

Bartholomew said: "I believe in the Holy Ghost";

Matthew said: "One holy catholic Church, communion of saints";

---

[1] "Till the middle of the seventeenth century it was the current belief of Roman Catholic and Protestant Christendom that the Apostles' Creed was '*membratim articulatimque*' composed by the Apostles in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, before their separation, to secure unity of teaching, each contributing an article (hence the somewhat arbitrary division into twelve articles). . . . The first trace of this legend, though without the distribution alluded to, we find at the close of the fourth century, in the *Expositio symboli* of Rufinus of Aquileja. . . . The same view is expressed with various modifications by Ambrosius of Milan in his *Explanatio symboli ad initiandos*; by John Cassianus, *De Incarnat. Dom.* vi. 3; Leo. M. *Ep.* 27 *Ad Pulcheriam*; Venantius Fortunatus, *Exposit. brevis symb. Ap.*; Isidorus of Seville. The distribution of the twelve Articles is of later date, and there is no unanimity in this respect" (Schaff, *History of the Creeds*, 1878, i. p. 22).

Simon said : " Forgiveness of sins " ;
Thaddaeus said : " Resurrection of the Flesh " ;
Matthias said : " Everlasting Life."

The singular thing about this legend is that, though devised for the *Old Roman Symbol* alone as the Baptismal Confession of the Church in Rome, it yet was later on attached to enlarged editions of this Confession which were used in the South Gallican and other Churches in the West in the ninth century. These Confessions were all daughters of the *Old Roman Symbol*, and yet they all contained independent variations. Hence they could not have known, or at any rate admitted, the legend of the Apostolic authorship, and therefore it is pretty certain that the legend was born after the Symbol had been adopted by these Churches.

But the South Gallican Creed of the second half of the fifth century with which our present Apostles' Creed is identical is not the *Old Roman Symbol*, but one of its daughters. How, then, did the legend of Apostolic authorship get itself transferred from the mother to the daughter ? The answer is one of the romances of history.

By the end of the fifth century the barbarian tribes who had planted themselves in the lands of their Roman allies had almost all embraced Christianity, but an unfortunate accident had " infused a deadly poison into the cup of Salvation." " The Ostrogoths, the Burgundians, the Suevi, and the Vandals, who had listened to the eloquence of the Latin clergy preferred the more intelligible lessons of their domestic teachers ; and Arianism was adopted as the natural faith of the warlike converts who were seated on the ruins of the Western empire." [1] The Church in Rome, true to its Catholic traditions, seems to have given point to the denunciations of its pulpits by adopting the strongly anti-Arian Creed of Constantinople [2] in place of its own *Old Roman Symbol.* The latter an Arian might have professed ; the Constantinopolitan barred the door of salvation effectually against him. Or the cause may have been twofold. By this time the Church in Rome was in

[1] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xxvii., Bury's ed., iv. 81.
[2] Our " Nicene " Creed.

close dependence on the Byzantine Court, and either fear, or hope of favour, might have concurred to cause it to adopt the Creed professed by the Eastern Court. Anyhow the *Old Roman Symbol* sank into oblivion for some three centuries.

In the latter part of the eighth century the political situation was different. The Eastern Empire no longer dominated the West, and Arianism was no longer a danger to the Faith. But the star of Charlemagne was in the ascendant, and as for three centuries Rome had complacently adopted the Creed of her Eastern master, so she now adopted that of her Western over-lord. And in doing this she regained her own Creed, but enlarged and otherwise modified. Thus the South Gallican Creed became the Baptismal Confession of Rome, and has continued to be that of the Churches of the West to the present time. And it is remarkable that none of our three Creeds bears its own name. Our Baptismal Creed is not the Apostles', the Nicene is the Constantinopolitan, and the Athanasian is not from Athanasius.

What additions distinguish the South Gallican Creed as we have it to-day from the Old Roman Symbol? The points of difference are eight:

(1) "Creator of heaven and earth" is added.

(2) "Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary" replaces "Born of the Holy Ghost and Mary the Virgin."

(3) "Suffered" is added.

(4) "Dead" is also new.

(5) "He descended into hell" is inserted.

(6) "Catholic" appears as an epithet of the "Church."

(7) "The Communion of Saints" is made to follow the "Church."

(8) "Eternal Life" is appended finally.

The following form gives a conspectus of the Creed (*a*) as it was before the *Old Roman Symbol* was composed, (*b*) the *Old Roman Symbol* itself, and (*c*) the Creed as it is:

I BELIEVE in God, Father, *Almighty*, [Maker of Heaven and Earth];

And in Christ Jesus, His *only* Son, our Lord; who was born of *Holy Ghost and* Mary the Virgin; who under Pontius Pilate was crucified, [dead] *and buried*; [who descended into Hades]; who *on the third day* rose again from the dead; who ascended into the heavens, sitteth at the right hand of [God] the Father [Almighty]; whence He cometh to judge quick and dead;

And in holy Spirit, *holy* [catholic] *Church*, [communion of Saints], *remission of sins, resurrection of flesh;* [and aeonian Life].[1]

We print two forms of the Middle-English form of the Creed from the thirteenth century from Maskell's *Monumenta ritualia Eccl. Ang.* iii. 251.

Hi true in God, fader hal-michttende, that makede heven and herdethe: and in Jhesu Krist, is anelepi sone, hure laverd, that was bigotin of the hali gast, and born of the mainden marie, pinid under Punce Pilate, festened to the rode, ded and dulvun, licht in til helle, the thride dai up ras fra dede to live, steȝ in til hevenne, sitis on his fadir richt hand, fadir al-waldand, he then sal cume to deme the quike an the dede. Hy troue hy theli gast, and hely Kirke, the samnnige of halȝes, forȝifnes of sinnes, uprisigen of fleyes, and life withhuten ende. Amen.

And the second runs:—

I bileve in god fadir almichty, sshipper of hevene and eorthe: and in Ihesus Crist, his onlepi sone, ure loverd, that is i-vang thurch the holy gost, bore of Marie Mayden, tholede pine under Pounce Pilat, picht on rode tre, ded and y-buriid, licht in to helle, the thridde day fram deth aros, steich in to hevene, sit on his fadir richt honde, God almichti, thenne is cominde to deme the quikke and the dede. I bileve in the holy gost, al holy chirche, mone of alle halwen, forȝivenes of sinne, fleiss uprising, lyf withuten ende. Amen.

Maskell also prints another Creed from the fourteenth

[1] The clauses printed in italic represent additions to older forms made *in* the *Old Roman Symbol* itself when it was drawn up *circa* A.D. 135-150; those in brackets are additions *to* the Symbol made in later times.

and another from the fifteenth century as well as that from the Prymer of 1538. They contain no substantial difference from the two above. In the second, God is " shapere of heuene and of erthe," and in the first occurs the phrase, " agenrisying of fleisch."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, James. *The Vitality of Platonism.* 1911.

Alger, W. R. *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life.* 1878.

Anz, Wilhelm. *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus.* 1897.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae.* 17th ed. 7 vols. Paris, 1856.

Summa contra Gentiles.

Arnim, Joannes von. *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta.* 3 vols. 1903

Augustinus, Aurelius. Benedictine Edition. 11 vols. folio. Paris, 1689.

Barth, C. *Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der valentinianischen Gnosis.* 1911.

Bergson, Henri. *An Introduction to Metaphysics.* Trans. F. E. Hulme. 1913.

Matière et mémoire. 9th ed. 1913.

Creative Evolution. Trans. Arthur Mitchell. 1911.

Bigg, Charles. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria.* 2nd ed. 1913.

Blass, Friedrich. *Grammar of New Testament Greek.* Trans. H. St. John Thackeray. 1905.

Bosanquet, Bernard. *The Principle of Individuality and Value.* 1912.

Bousset, W. *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter.* 1903.

Hauptprobleme der Gnosis. 1907.

Bradley, F. H. *Appearance and Reality.* 1893.

Briggs, C. A. *The Fundamental Christian Faith.* 1913.

Burkitt, F. C. *Early Christianity outside the Roman Empire.* 1899.

Cabrol, Fernand. *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (in course).

Caldecott, Alfred. *The Philosophy of Religion.* 1901.

Caldwell. *Pragmatism and Idealism.* 1913.

Chamberlain, Houston Stewart. *Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.* 2 vols. 1904.

Charles, R. H. *The Book of Enoch.* 1893.

Eschatology. 1899.

The Ascension of Isaiah. 1900.

CHEETHAM, S. *The Mysteries Pagan and Christian.* 1897.
CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA. Ed. "von der Kirchenväter-Kommission, etc." Leipzig, 1905.
CRAWLEY, A. E. *The Mystic Rose, a Study of Primitive Marriage.* 1902.
CROCE, BENEDETTO. *Philosophy of the Practical.* Trans. Douglas Ainslie. 1913.
CUMONT, FRANZ. *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism.* Eng. trans. 1911.
Les Mystères de Mithra. 1902.
DALMAN, GUSTAF. *The Words of Jesus.* Trans. D. M. Kay. 1902.
DEANE, W. H. *Pseudepigrapha.* 1891.
DEISSMANN, G. ADOLF. *Bible Studies.* Trans. A. Grieve. 1901.
DELITZSCH, FRANZ. *A System of Biblical Psychology.* Trans. M. L. McClure. 1903.
DENZINGER, HENRICUS. *Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum.* 1874.
DEUSSEN, PAUL. *The Elements of Metaphysics.* Trans. C. M. Duff. 1909.
DIBELIUS, MARTIN. *Die urchristliche uberlieferung von Johannes dem Taufer.* 1911.
DIETERICH, ALBRECHT. *Abraxas.* 1891.
Eine Mithrasliturgie. 1910.
DILL, SAMUEL. *Roman Society in the last Century of the Western Empire.* 1898.
DUCHESNE, L. *Christian Worship, its Origin and Evolution.* Trans. M. L. McClure. 1903.
DU PREL, CARL. *Philosophy of Mysticism.* Trans. C. C. Massey.
EDERSHEIM, ALFRED. *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.* 2 vols. 1887.
EPIPHANIUS. Ed. Dindorf. 5 vols. Lipsiae, 1859.
ESPÉRANDIEU, E. *Inscriptions antiques de Lectoure.*
FIRMICUS MATERNUS. In "*Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum.*" Vienna, 1867.
"FOUNDATIONS." *Nine Essays by Seven Oxford Men.* 1913.
FRAZER, J. G. *The Golden Bough.* 2 vols. (now enlarged). 1890.
GIBBON, EDWARD. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* Ed. J. B. Bury. 7 vols. 1900.
GRANT, ALEXANDER. *The Ethics of Aristotle.* 2 vols. 1885.
GREEN, THOMAS HILL. *Works.* Ed. R. L. Nettleship. 3 vols. 1908.
HARNACK, ADOLF. *Reden und Aufsätze.* 2 Bände. 1904.
History of Dogma. Eng. trans. 7 vols. 1897.
Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. 1902.
Zur Quellenkritik der Geschichte des Gnosticismus. 1873.
Das Wesen des Christentums. 1900.

HARNACK, ADOLF. *Die altchristliche Litteratur bis Eusebius.* 3 vols. Leipzig, 1897.

Das Zeugnis des Irenäus über das Ansehen der römischen Kirche. 1893: *Sitzber. der Königl. preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften,* pp. 939-955.

HATCH, EDWIN. *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church.* 1891.

HEITMÜLLER, WILHELM. "*Im Namen Jesu.*" 1903.

HEPDING, HUGO. *Attis, seine Mythen und seine Kult.* 1903.

HILGENFELD, ADOLF. *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums.* Leipzig, 1884.

HIPPOLYTUS. Works in Ante-nicene Christian Library. 2 vols.

INGE, W. R. *Christian Mysticism.*

IRENAEUS. Ed. W. W. Harvey. 2 vols. 1857.

JAMES, WILLIAM. *The Principles of Psychology.* 2 vols. 1890.

JEVONS, F. B. *Introduction to the History of Religion.* 1896.

JORDAN, HERMANN. *Geschichte der altchristl. Litteratur.* 1911.

JOWETT, BENJAMIN. *The Dialogues of Plato.* 1892 f.

KANT, IMMANUEL. *Critique of Pure Reason.* Trans. F. Max Müller. 1881.

KRAUSS, SAMUEL. *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen.* Berlin, 1902.

KREYENBÜHL, JOHANNES. *Das Evangelium der Wahrheit.* 2 vols. 1900.

KUTSCH, FERDINAND. *Attische Heilgötter und Heilheroen.* 1913.

LIETZMANN, HANS. *Der Menschensohn.* 1896.

LOTZE, HERMANN. *Microcosmus.* Trans. E. Hamilton and E. E. Constance Jones. 2 vols. 1885.

LUMBY, J. R. *The History of the Creeds.* 1873.

MCDOUGALL, WILLIAM. *Body and Mind.* 1911.

MCGIFFERT, A. C. *The Apostles' Creed.* 1902.

MCTAGGART, JOHN MCT. E. *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology.* 1901.

MOBERLY, R. C. *Atonement and Personality.* 1901.

ORIGEN. *Werke.* Ed. "von der Kirchenväter-Kommission, etc." 1899.

PETRIE, W. M. FLINDERS. *Religion and Conscience in Ancient Egypt.* 1898.

PFLEIDERER, OTTO. *Primitive Christianity.* Eng. trans. 2 vols. 1910.

PHILO. *Opera quae supersunt.* Ed. Leopoldus Cohn. 5 vols. 1896.

POULLAIN, R. P. AUG. *The Graces of Interior Prayer.* Trans. by Leonora L. Yorke-Smith. 1910.

PREUSCHEN, ERWIN. *Antilegomena.* 2nd ed. Giessen, 1905.

RASHDALL, HASTINGS. *The Theory of Good and Evil.* 2 vols. 1907.

REALENCYKLOPÄDIE für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. 24 vols. 1896 f.

RÉCÉJAC, E. *Essay on the Bases of the Mystic Knowledge.* Trans. S. C. Upton. 1899.
REINACH, SOLOMON. *Cultes, mythes et religions.* 1906.
REITZENSTEIN, R. *Poimandres.* 1904.
RESCH, ALFRED. *Agrapha, aussercanonische Schriftfragmente.* Leipzig, 1906.
RICKABY, JOHN. *General Metaphysics.* 1894.
RITCHIE, DAVID G. *Natural Rights.* 1903.
ROBERTSON, ARCHIBALD. *Regnum Dei.* 1901.
ROHDE, ERWIN. *Psyche.* 1894.
ROYCE, JOSIAH. *The World and the Individual.* 1900.
SCHMIDT, CARL. *Koptische-gnostische Schriften.* Band 1. 1905.
SCHMIDTKE, ALFRED. *Neue Fragmente und Untersuchungen zu den judenchristlichen Evangelien.* 1911.
SCHÜRER, EMIL. *A History of the Jewish People.* Eng. trans. 5 vols. 1897.
SCHWEGLER, ALBERT. *A History of Philosophy.* Trans. J. H. Seelye. 1864.
SELWYN, EDWARD C. *The Christian Prophets.* 1900.
St. Luke the Prophet. 1901.
SHARPE, A. B. *Mysticism, its true Nature and Value.* 1910.
SIDGWICK, HENRY. *The Methods of Ethics.* 7th ed. 1907.
SIEGFRIED, CARL. *Philo von Alexandria.* 1875.
SMITH, W. B. *Ecce Deus.* 1912.
STOUT. *Manual of Psychology.* 1899.
SWAINSON. *Nicene and Apostles' Creeds.* 1875.
SWETE, H. B. *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church.* 1912.
THEOLOGIA GERMANICA, "Golden Treasury" series, and *Theologia Deutsch*, F. Pfeiffer. 1900.
VAN EYSINGA, G. A. VAN DEN BERGH. *Indische Einflüsse auf evangelische Erzählungen.* 1909.
WALLACE, WILLIAM. *The Logic of Hegel.* 1874.
WARD, JAMES. *Naturalism and Agnosticism.* 2 vols. 1899.
The Realm of Ends. 2nd ed. 1912.
WEIZÄCKER, CARL VON. *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church.* Eng. trans. 2 vols. 1897.
WIEDEMANN, ALFRED. *The Ancient Egyptian Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul.* 1895.
ZAHN, THEODOR. *The Apostles' Creed.* Trans. by C. S. and A. E. Burn. 1899.
ZELLER, E. *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics.* Trans. O. J. Reichel. 1870.

INDEX

Abide, a technical term, 248
Adam, James, *Vitality of Platonism*, 331, 489 *n.*, 509
Aeon, as spiritual Principle, 27, 327 *n.*, 500 ff.
  as temporal Principle, 497 ff.
  Gnostic use of term, 505 ff.
Alger, R. W., on metempsychosis, 133
  on nature of the soul, 484
  on resurrection, 474
Analogy, law of, 220 f., 223, 288
An-archism and Christianity, 183
Anaxagoras, 487
Angels, their work, 295 f.
Anselm, 198
Anz, W., 265 *n.*, 342, 509 *n.*, 512
Aorist, gnomic, 269, 271 *n.*, 368 *n.*
Aphraates, Creed of, 403
Apostle, its meanings, 384
Aquinas, Thomas, on Faith, 60 *n.*
  on Incarnation, 103
  on resurrection-body, 241, 474
  on Righteousness, 323 *n.*
  on the Soul, 484 *n.*
  on Substance, 450 f.
  on Synderesis, 101 *n.*
Aristides, *Apology* of, 29 *n.*
Aristotle, 449, 450 *n.*, 453 *n.*, 255 *n.*
  on State, 347 *n.*
Ascension a continuous act, 269
  variously dated, 262
Asceticism, 196
Associationist school, 94
Athanasius on baptism, 403, 423, 427
  on deification, 76 *n.*, 116, 119, 129
Attis, 417
Augustine on appearance and reality, 37 *n.*, 103 *n.*
  on Ascension, 263 *n.*
  on Baptism of Jesus, 73 *n.*
  on the Church, 351 *n.*, 380
  on Conversion, 75 *n.*
  on Deification, 119, 129
  on Faith, 60 *n.*
Augustine on heaven, 98 *n.*
  on honour paid to martyrs, 399
  on Judgment, 304 *n.*
  on saved, 394 *n.*, 396 *n*,
  on Self and God, 459, 460 *n.*
  on symbolism of clouds, 292 *n.*
  on the Trinity, 46 *n.*
Authority, its office, 3

Baldwin, Professor, on "projective" and "ejective," 324
  on the Self, 454
Baptism, its formula, 66, 305
  Jewish, 404
  John's, 405
  of Pagan origin, 405 ff.
Baruch, *Apocalypse* of, 370, 444, 469, 512 *n.*
Beauty defined, 211
Bede, 128
Belief. *See* Faith
Bergson, H., Continuator of Kant, 521
  on Intellect, 331 *n.*, 522
  on Intention, 457, 522
  on Matter, 98
  on Progress, 489
Bigg, C., *Christian Platonists*, 398, 429 *n.*, 509 *n.*
Blass, Friedrich, *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, 65 *n.*, 269 *n.*, 293 *n.*, 512 *n.*
Body, the resurrection-, 472 f.
Bonwetsch on Christian mysteries, 24
Bousset, W., on aeon-doctrine, 336 *n.*, 340
  on Judaism, 22, 443
  on Messianism, 21
  on *Son of Man*, 536
Bradley, F. H., 80, 455 f.
Briggs, C. A., on aeonian life, 496
  on communion of saints, 395 *n.*
  on remission of sins, 422
  on resurrection-body, 478

Browning, R., "By the Fireside," 213
"Christmas-eve," 38, 52, 99
"Luria," 183 *n.*
Buddhism, its denial of the Self, 458

Caldecott, Dr. A., on Attention, 61
on ethical consciousness, 122
on God, 67
on Mysticism, 33
on ontological argument, 198
on Theology, 220
Caldwell, *Pragmatism and Idealism*, 453 *n.*
"Catholic," its emergence, 334 *n.*, 446
in Ignatius, 374 f.
its meaning, 376
Charles, R. H., 442, 444, 469 *n.*, 477 *n.*
Christ as the Dweller in the Innermost, 121
not translation of "Messiah," 120
a term of supremacy, 103, 106
Christianity as a new creation, 461
in the form of burial-guilds, 24
not the child of Judaism, 21, 67, 68
its essence is in the life of Christ, 21
discordant descriptions of it, 55
as Life, 514
a mystery-religion, 22, 24
originally mystical, 19
derived from Paganism, 21, 399, 405
Chrysostom on exorcism, 427
Church, in what sense Apostolic, 386
a Brotherhood, 23, 29, 150, 179, 181
Creation of Holy Spirit, 391
as heavenly Jerusalem, 370
its holiness, 367
the ideal, 335, 345
the ideal and the empirical, 178, 348, 349, 369
according to Ignatius, 374 f.
and Lambeth Conference, 358 f.
and martyrs, 397 ff.
and missions, 388
of Rome and Unity, 360
of Rome, its three weapons, 382
its secularisation, 350, 373
as Sophia, 337 f., 345
and State, 53, 54, 346
and those outside, 51
its unity, true ground of, 362
Cleanthes, Hymn of, 68
Clement of Alexandria, 63 *n.*, 73 *n.*, 77 *n.*, 78 *n.*, 117, 118, 265 *n.*, 335, 378 *n.*, 379, 398, 400, 420 *n.*, 429, 449, 467, 468 *n.*, 509, 511, 536
Clement of Rome, 77 *n.*, 343
Clement II., 329, 331, 332, 335, 337, 339, 345, 439
Clouds as symbolic, 290, 292 *n.*
Cobb, W. F., Note on Αἰών, 21, 27
article on Faith-healing, 317 *n.*
article on "Forgiveness," 111 *n.*
Communion, Holy. *See* Eucharist
Compensation, Law of, 160
Constitutions, Apostolic, 425
Conversion, 523 f., 527. *See* Regeneration
Corpus Hermeticum, 142, 333, 340 *n.*, 369 *n.*
Creation, its meanings, 89, 91, 99
Creationism, 127, 485
Creed, the, relation to History, 8, 48
not based on Miracles, 10
derived from mystic experience, 3, 14, 41, 42
in Protestantism and Catholicism, 1
variously interpreted, 15, 58, 59
Croce, Benedetto, 465
Crucifixion as law of Christ-life, 201 ff.
name for conquest of Egoism, 194, 196
as law of Nature, 200
a mystical process, 193 f., 461
as universal process, 10
Cumont, Franz, 406, 407, 408 *n.*, 416, 419, 443, 474 *n.*
Cyril of Jerusalem, on *Catholic*, 377

Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, 68 *n.*, 512 *n.*
Dante, 200 *n.*, 247, 248, 306 *n.*, 342 *n.*
Darmesteter on Analogy, 221
Dead, the cult of, 397 f.
Death never physical in N.T., 300 f.
as dissolution of complex, 222
as self-assertion, 208, 222
spiritual, what it is, 224
Degeneration, modern, 86
Deification, 76 *n.*, 117, 119, 129
Deissman, *Bible Studies*, 215 *n.*
Delitzsch, Fr., 198 *n.*, 214 f., 227 *n.*, 287 *n.*
Democracy not yet born, 188

Demons, 63, 122, 424, 506
Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, 148 *n.*, 423 *n.*
Descartes on mind and matter, 91
Devil, not identical with Satan, 177. *See also* Satan
Dieterich, *Mithrasliturgie*, 69, 409 *n.*, 508 *n.*
Diognetum, Ep. ad, 371 *n.*, 372 *n.*
Dionysius, the Areopagite, 34
Dualism, solved by Life, 7
Duality, 97, 173, 272, 431 f.
Duchesne, L., 409 *n.*, 423, 426

Earth, its meaning, 88, 98, 266
Ecclesiasticism a degenerate form of Christianity, 178 f., 348
its limits, 3
Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, 413
Ego, the, what it is, 223
Egoism, its many forms, 280
is sin, 268, 307, 327
Eleusis, 23
Emanation-doctrine, 100
Enoch, Book of, 443 f., 468, 530
Epigenesis, 485
Epiphanius, 73 *n.*, 141, 337, 369 *n.*, 536
Espérandieu, 406, 408 *n.*
Eternity defined, 513
Ethics, the objective basis of, 85
Eucharist, Holy, of Pagan origin, 414 ff.
Evil variously defined, 172 f.
questions Omnipotence, 176
Evolution a one-sided doctrine, 266
and Society, 183
Exorcism, 171 *n.*
Experience and Character, 61

Faith, act of the whole man, 64
identical with Life, 515
its nature, 63, 291 *n.*, 292, 516, 519 f.
opposed to Intellectualism, 521
Father, a term of Hellenism, 68
its significance with Jesus, 71
its significance in Judaism, 70
a mystical term, 67
includes motherhood, 152
Name of Unmanifest, 115
Faustus of Rhegium, 396, 403
Flesh, its N.T. meaning, 446
Forgiveness, two conceptions of, 434
defined, 430
Foucart on "Word of Power," 441
Foundations, W. H. Moberly on the Self, 455
A. Rawlinson on religion as universal, 421 *n.*
A. Rawlinson on spirit and matter, 474 *n.*
W. Temple on Divinity of Christ, 105, 421
Frazer, J. G., *Golden Bough*, 419 *n.*, 420
Freedom, world of, 83, 295, 342, 349

Geulincx and Occasionalism, 92, 93
Gibbon, his five secondary causes, 308 *n.*
Gnosticism, its Aeon-doctrine, 114 *n.*
in Christianity, 24-27, 265, 330 *n.*, 331, 332, 336 ff., 341, 342
as Religion, 343 f.
its threefold division of man, 106
and Virgin-birth, 141
God buried in His world, 209
Crucifixion of, 197
as Father, 71
as a generic term, 506
alone immortal, 234
Kingdom of, is Life, 515
as Mother, 152
Gore Charles, on Christian Ministry, 20
on Virgin-birth, 136 *n.*
Gregory Nazianz on *alών*, 510
Gunkel, H., 142
Guyon, Madame, 279 *n.*, 292 *n.*

Harnack, H., on the Apostolikum, 54 *n.*, 299
on Ascension, 262 *n.*
on pre-existence of Christ, 135
on threefold birth of Christ, 144 *n.*
on rise of Catholicism, 343 *n.*, 349 *n.*
on early Church-officers, 313 *n.*
on pre-existence of Church, 320 *n.*, 346 *n.*
on the primitive Church, 372
on transformation in Church, 334 *n.*
on Communion of Saints, 395
on demons, 506 *n.*
on use of the term Father, 76 *n.*
on *God* as a generic term, 507 *n.*
on Gnosticism, 265, 341 *n.*, 342 *n.*, 343 *n.*, 532
on Irenaeus, 383 *n.*

Healing, gift of, 316 f.
Heaven, its meaning, 88, 98, 266
Hedonism, 87
Hegel, his absolute Idealism, 95, 283 *n.*
on the State, 189
on the Universal, 185
Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 63 *n.*, 409 *n.*, 477 *n.*
Hepding, *Attis*, 407, 419
Heraclitus, 174 *n.*, 331, 400
Heredity, 82, 127
Hermas, *Shepherd* of, 313 *n.*, 328 f., 331, 332, 333, 335, 345, 368, 369 *n.*, 439
Herod, type of godless culture, 179 f.
Heroes and Martyrs, cult of, 399
Hill. *See* Mount
Hippolytus, 26, 118, 141, 340 *n.*, 507, 508, 509, 533 f., 535
Holmes, O. W., 488 *n.*
"Hymn of the Soul," 76 *n.*, 265, 341
Hypsistos, 417

Idealism, 94
Ignatius of Antioch, 374 f., 392
Illusion, law of, 173
Immanence, doctrine of, its danger, 87, 90
Immortality not a Christian doctrine, 235, 464
a contingent gift, 233
Rohde on, 42 *n.*, 465 *n.*
Incarnation and Ascension, 263
and Descent into Hades, 218
as a universal, 10
Individual superior to Society, 185, 187
Inge, R. W., 33
Intellectualism opposed to Faith, 520
Irenaeus quoted, 26, 76 *n.*, 77 *n.*, 118, 331, 336 f., 339 f., 344, 379, 382 f., 392, 393, 428, 471, 511 *n.*, 535, 536

James, W., 245, 451 f., 454 *n.*, 464
Jesus, His authority, 112, 275 ff., 524
God's "only Son," 114
meaning of the term, 111
on Mount, 369
Opposition to State-authority, 182, 524
as the Paraclete, 294
physical resurrection of, not a dogma, 235 ff.
Jesus, pre-existence of, 107, 109, 264
Second Coming of, 289, 293 *n.*, 109,
His silences, 525
as the Super-man, 132
Temptations of, 161 ff.
as transcendent, 123
Virgin-birth of, not a religious fact, 135 f.
Jevons, *History of Religion*, 410, 416, 419
John Damascene on *αἰών*, 510
Judaism a syncretistic religion, 21
Judgment, its meaning, 297 f.
Justin Martyr, 73 *n.*, 144, 371, 428, 438, 439, 477 *n.*

King, C. W., 532
Kingsford, Anna, 152 *n.*, 253 *n.*
Kirn, O., on the Trinity, 47 *n.*
Kreyenbühl, *Das Evangelium der Wahrheit*, 312 *n.*, 325 *n.*

Lambeth Conference on Unity, 358f.
Larochefoucauld on Egoism, 194
Law, William, *Way to Divine Knowledge*, 47 *n.*
Leibniz, founder of Pluralism, 92
on nature of God, 199 *n.*
Liddon, H. C., on Reincarnation, 129
Life and Form, 19, 41, 149, 187, 430, 473
its activities, 246-61
risen, its characteristics, 242-6.
See also Death
Lilly, W. S., 222 *n.*
Locke on soul and body, 93
Lotze, H., on Beauty, 98 *n.*
on Brotherhood, 281 *n.*
on Duality, 283, 363
on experience, 80
on the Divine Idea, 102
on Immortality, 464, 466 *n.*
on Individuality, 99
on Infinite and Finite, 61 *n.*, 270 *n.*
on innate powers, 116
on Mechanism, 448
on Place, 215
on Plurality and Unity, 36 *n.*
on Rights, 322
on the Self, 455

McGiffert, A. C., 66 *n.*
McTaggart, J. M. E., on mystic consciousness, 117 *n.*

McTaggart, J. M. E., on sense of self, 526
Magic, 163
Malebranche on two substances, 92
Manichaean *Son of Man*, 537
Manilius, 75
Martyrs, cult of, whence derived, 397-400
Matter, its mission, 448
Mechanism in Nature, 448
Meredith, George, *The Egoist*, 195
Messiah. *See* Christ
Miracles not the base of the Creed, 10, 13
  not a necessary mode of Divine activity, 13
  sense of the term, 12
Mithras, 23, 333, 407
Moberly, R. C., 104
Monogenes, 114 *n.*, 115
Mother and Child, image of, 153
Motherhood of God, 152
Mount a type of Contemplation, 165, 369
Mystery-rites, 23, 333, 399, 401, 405 f., 416
Mysticism and authority, 53
  Christian, and ecstasy, 35
  as feeling, 33
  as harmonising force, 59, 171
  and history, 44, 47 f., 50
  the religion of Jesus, 39
  and of His disciples, 39
  is individualistic, 17, 37, 45, 53
  at once individual and social, 38, 53, 525 f.
  as immediate intuition, 33, 40, 84
  as Life, 7, 523
  as Love, 97, 116, 523
  gives the meaning of all things, 40
  its negative aspect, 31
  as the equivalent of the miraculous, 15
  its non-rational character, 32
  root of Sacramentalism, 36, 100
  not in itself theological, 16
  true and false, 2
  as result of God's working, 34, 43
Myths as truths of poetry, 145, 146, 210

Necessity in Nature, 77 *n.*, 81, 181
  as Heredity, 82
Nicetas, 393 *n.*
Novatians, 350
Numbers, significance of, 46 *n.*, 162 *n.*, 167, 173, 229 ff., 246, 250, 253 *n.*, 259 *n.*, 260 *n.*, 363, 385, 467

"Old Man," 216 f.
Omnipotence, its meaning, 79, 219
Only-Begotten. *See* Monogenes
Optimism and Pessimism, 27-30
Origen on the Church, 378 *n.*
  on deification, 119
  on the descent of Jesus, 512
  on exorcism, 427, 477
  quotes Gospel of Hebrews, 369 *n.*
  on pre-existence, 132 f.
  on the resurrection-body, 471
  on syncretism, 417
  use of *αἰώνιος*, 512
Orphism, 470
Orthodox Church and Unity, 361
Osiris as the Self, 475

Panthcism as acosmism, 5
  and Theism, 90
Parallelism, psycho-physical, 6
Patmore, Coventry, *The Rod, the Root, and the Flower*, 381 *n.*
Penance, sacrament of, 435 f.
Pessimism and Optimism, 27-30
Pfleiderer, O., 409 *n.*, 414
Pharisees and Reincarnation, 469, 470
Philo, 115, 141, 420 *n.*, 510, 539
Phoenicians, cosmology of, 503
Pistis-Sophia, 339, 509, 536
Poimandres, 69
Polycarp, Epistle of, 77 *n.*, 368
  martyrdom of, 77 *n.*
Poulain, Father, on Mysticism, 34
  on Symbols, 139
Pragmatism, 96
Prayer, how answered, 402
Pre-existence of Jesus, 107, 109, 125 ff., 130
  reasons for, 61, 124 f.
Priest and Prophet, 4
Process and event, 8, 49, 147, 270, 289, 293 *n.*
Prophet and Priest, 4
  preceded Priest, 313 *n.*
Prophets of all religions, 168
Psychical as a Gnostic term, 466 ff.
Puritanism, its one-sidedness, 447

Rashdall, H., on asceticism, 197 *n.*
  on end and means, 90 *n.*
  on pre-existence, 491 *n.*
  on punishment, 283 *n.*
  on rights, 481 *n.*
Récéjac, 32, 34, 101, 103, 139, 171, 282 *n.*, 523 *n.*, 526
Regeneration, 518, 527. *See* Conversion
Reincarnation, 127, 129, 238

Reincarnation, not condemned by the Church, 129 *n.*
Fr. Delitzsch on, 227 *n.*
as an intermediate state, 481-495
and the N.T., 130
as Purgatory, 490. *See also* Pre-existence
Reitzenstein, R., Poimandres, 69 *n.*, 507 *n.*, 538
Religion, not subject to formulation, 267
Resch, *Agrapha*, 369 *n.*, 371 *n.*
Resurrection, life of, is mysterious, 242
a mystic process, 232
stories of, only intelligible as mystic, 242
Revolution, French, 29
Rickaby, J., 450 *n.*
Robertson, A., *Regnum Dei*, 353, 354 *n.*
Robinson, J. A., on Virgin-birth, 136 *n.*
Rogers, Thorold, 53 *n.*
Rohde, E., *Psyche*, 42 *n.*, 465 *n.*, 509
Royce, Josiah, on Individuality, 366 *n.*

Saints, cult of, 401
Salmon, George, *Infallibility of the Church*, 45
Sanday, W., on Fourth Gospel, 323 *n.*
on Life, 515 f.
Sarapion's Prayer-Book, 425
Satan as an archangel, 174, 271
and the devil, 175 f.
derived from Mazdaean religion, 172
as the Tester, 175, 304 *n.*, 325 f. *See also* Devil
Scheffler, *The Mystic Catholic*, 56, 146
Scotus, John, on the Trinity, 46 *n.*
Self, higher, 286 f., 526
ideal and empirical, 285, 455, 458, 461
various meanings of, 453
Self-control, 286
Selwyn, E. C., on Prophets, 313 *n.*, 378 *n.*
Seneca, 69, 442 *n.*
Sharpe, A. B., 101
Sin as blindness, 323
as egoism, 286
as self-will, 162
as tendency, 273
Smith, W. B., *Ecce Deus*, 420 *n.*
Socialism, 163 *n.*, 277 ff.
Societies, secret, 23, 24, 29
Society and the Individual, 185
not an organism, 183
and punishment, 282
"Son of Man," 111 *n.*, 167, 418
Sophia. *See* Church
Soul as active, 11
as subject to death, 225
its existence doubtful, 106
not in itself immortal, 233
as name for individuated spirit, 449
organ of spirit, 213, 448
as substance, 6, 9
Spinoza, his acosmism, 92
Spirit, Holy, as cause of Christianity, 309, 312, 391
is Spirit of Christ, 430
gifts of, 314 ff.
as creator of holiness, 310
as impersonal, 306
acts on the world, 319 ff.
State, the, a mark of barbarism, 190
its duties, 346
a form of Evil, 181, 187, 281
the servant of the Individual, 187
distinct from Society, 187, 347
Suffering in animal world, 157
of Jesus Christ, 161 ff., 167 ff.
in man's psychic life, 158
in man's spiritual life, 158 f.
as price of progress, 155
in vegetable world, 157
Sully, *The Human Mind*, 453
Swete, H. B., 306, 332 *n.*, 343, 393 *n.*
Symbol, more real than fact, 289
its true nature, 138 ff., 140
Synderesis, 101 *n.*, 202 *n.*

Tagore, R., 462 *n.*
"Tat tvam asi," 97
Taurobolium, 405 f.
Tertullian, 145, 150, 333, 378 *n.*, 409, 411, 439
Testament of our Lord, 426
Theism, 90
Theodotus on Virgin-birth, 136 *n.*
Theologia Germanica, 16, 35, 353, 458
Thompson, Francis, 175 *n.*
Tol'doth Jesu, 165
Tongues, gift of, 317 f.
Tradition, 15
Traducianism, 127, 485
Trinity, doctrine of, rational not mystical, 46

Universe as Son of God, 115

Values, world of, 284 f.
Virgin-birth not a dogma, 135 f.
  Harnack on, 135 *n.*
  in paganism, 143 f.
  in Philo, 141
  a mystical process, 138, 147, 151
  a symbol, 140, 153

Wallace, W., 189
Ward, James, on attention, 156
  on idealistic Creation, 90 *n.*
  on dualism, 97
Ward, James, on Immortality, 465, 493
  on other modes of life, 490
  on repentance, 433 *n.*
  on the Self, 454, 457
Weizäcker on pre-existence of Jesus, 130
  on resurrection-body, 478
Wiedemann, Egyptian doctrine of immortality, 440, 476

Zeller, E., on Stoicism, 69, 467 *n.*, 507

THE END

Printed by R. & R. Clark, Limited, *Edinburgh.*

WYCLIFFE
COLLEGE
LIBRARY